

## The Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit

# Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae

TEXTS AND STUDIES OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LIFE AND LANGUAGE

*Editors-in-Chief*

D.T. Runia  
G. Rouwhorst

*Editorial Board*

J. den Boeft  
B.D. Ehrman  
K. Greschat  
J. Lössl  
J. van Oort  
C. Scholten

VOLUME 147

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/vcs*

# The Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit

*Prosopological Exegesis and the Development  
of Pre-Nicene Pneumatology*

*By*

Kyle R. Hughes



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

## The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Hughes, Kyle R., author.

Title: The Trinitarian testimony of the spirit : prosopological exegesis and the development of pre-Nicene pneumatology / by Kyle R. Hughes.

Description: Boston : Brill, 2018. | Series: Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 0920-623X ; Volume 147 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018016524 (print) | LCCN 2018017621 (ebook) |

ISBN 9789004369894 ((e-book)) | ISBN 9789004368712 ((hardback)) : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Holy Spirit--History of doctrines--Early church, ca. 30-600. | Trinity. | Justin, Martyr, Saint. | Irenaeus, Saint, Bishop of Lyon. | Tertullian, approximately 160-approximately 230.

Classification: LCC BT119 (ebook) | LCC BT119 .H84 2018 (print) |

DDC 231/.309015--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018016524>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: [brill.com/brill-typeface](http://brill.com/brill-typeface).

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 978-90-04-36871-2 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-36989-4 (e-book)

Copyright 2018 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi, Brill Sense and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

# Contents

Acknowledgements	VII
List of Tables	IX
Abbreviations and Citations	X

## Introduction 1

Orientation	2
<i>The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology</i>	2
<i>The Topos of Divine Testimony</i>	9
<i>Prosopological Exegesis</i>	12
Methodology	22
Plan	27

## 1 Justin and the Emergence of the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit 29

Justin and the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit	33
<i>Justin's Use of Prosopological Exegesis</i>	35
<i>The Spirit and Prosopological Exegesis in Dial. 56</i>	38
Differentiating Justin's Use of Prosopological Exegesis	46
<i>Prosopological Exegesis from the Father</i>	46
<i>Prosopological Exegesis from the Son</i>	51
<i>Prosopological Exegesis from the Spirit</i>	54
Justin and His Sources	63
Historical-Theological Context: Justin and Early Christian Self-Definition	68
<i>Justin and Judaism</i>	69
<i>Justin and Marcion</i>	74
<i>Justin and Platonic Philosophy</i>	77
The New Testament Roots of Justin's Exegesis	79
<i>The Influence of Johannine Pneumatology</i>	81
<i>The Influence of Pauline Pneumatology</i>	87
<i>The Influence of the Pneumatology of Hebrews</i>	91
Justin Martyr: Summary and Implications	95

## 2 Irenaeus and the Refinement of the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit 98

Irenaeus and the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit	102
<i>Irenaeus's Use of Prosopological Exegesis</i>	105
<i>The Spirit and Prosopological Exegesis in Haer. 3.6.1</i>	110

Differentiating Irenaeus's Use of Prosopological Exegesis	121
<i>Prosopological Exegesis from the Father</i>	121
<i>Prosopological Exegesis from the Son</i>	125
<i>Prosopological Exegesis from the Spirit</i>	126
Historical-Theological Context: The Testimony of the Spirit in the Divine Economy	133
<i>Irenaeus and the Divine Economy</i>	134
<i>Irenaeus and the Testimony of the Spirit in the Divine Economy</i>	137
Irenaeus: Summary and Implications	145
 3 Tertullian and the Decline of the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit	149
Tertullian and the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit	155
<i>Tertullian's Use of Prosopological Exegesis</i>	157
<i>The Spirit and Prosopological Exegesis in Prax. 11</i>	163
Differentiating Tertullian's Use of Prosopological Exegesis	167
<i>Prosopological Exegesis from the Father</i>	167
<i>Prosopological Exegesis from the Son</i>	173
<i>Prosopological Exegesis from the Spirit</i>	176
Historical-Theological Context: The Testimony of the Spirit in the Redefined Divine Economy	182
<i>Tertullian and the Divine Economy</i>	182
<i>Tertullian and the Testimony of the Spirit in the Divine Economy</i>	186
<i>Tertullian and the Personhood of the Spirit in the Divine Economy</i>	190
After Tertullian: The Decline of Pneumatology in the Latin Tradition	194
<i>Cyprian of Carthage</i>	195
<i>Novatian of Rome</i>	199
Tertullian: Summary and Implications	202
 Conclusion	206
 Bibliography	215
Index of Ancient Sources	234
Index of Modern Authors	246
Index of Names and Subjects	250

# Acknowledgements

This work constitutes a slightly revised version of my doctoral dissertation written at Radboud University Nijmegen under the direction of Professor Jan van der Watt. I extend my most sincere gratitude to “Prof. Jan,” whose academic erudition skillfully guided this project from conception to completion and whose personal concern for me and my family never ceased to be an encouragement. I am also grateful to my co-supervisor, Dr. Chris de Wet, who was most thorough and helpful in challenging and refining my work at every step of the process. I would also like to thank Dr. Matthew Bates and Dr. Stephen Presley for introducing me to the study of prosopological exegesis, as well as the members of my manuscript committee, Dr. Daniela Müller, Dr. Alan Culpepper, and Dr. Hennie Stander. Very special thanks are due to Dr. Daniel B. Wallace, who has been a longtime academic mentor and whose encouragement and guidance has shaped so much of my academic journey so far.

I must also express gratitude to those friends, family, colleagues, and students who have helped in various ways to get this project across the finish line: R.J. Barthelmes, Jessica Bonnem, Jack Charles, Maggie Heiskell, Jeff Horner, Alex Hughes, Bryan Klein, Christian Knox, David McBride, David McCune, Patrick Spellissy, Caleb Ward, and Nicole Ward. Special credit is due to my colleague Trevor Moore and my longtime friend Greg Barnhill, who both went above and beyond in their contributions to commenting on and editing this manuscript. I would be beyond remiss if I did not also thank my parents, Bob and Stephanie Hughes, and my mother-in-law, Joanne Ward, for all that they have done, financially and otherwise, to help me along this journey. At an institutional level, Whitefield Academy has been generous in its support of my efforts at completing this book, with thanks due especially to Kevin Bracher and Nathan Stevens for affirming my calling to pursue scholarship while working to further Christ-centered secondary education. For their efforts in helping produce the best possible manuscript, I must also extend my gratitude to the team at Brill and to the anonymous reviewers who provided helpful comments concerning various aspects of this project.

Most of all, I would like to thank my wife Karisa. As her name suggests, she is indeed the living embodiment of grace in my life. Her unfailing support of me through all the ups and downs of this process has been without question the most important factor in bringing me to the conclusion of this journey. Karisa, on account of the many sacrifices you have made on my behalf and because of the love that you continue to pour out on me each and every day, I dedicate this book to you and to our beautiful children, Aliya and Asher. Truly God has blessed me as rich beyond measure.

Some of the seeds for what would become chapters 1 and 3 of this book were initially published as “The Spirit Speaks: Pneumatological Innovation in the Scriptural Exegesis of Justin and Tertullian,” *VC* 69 (2015): 463–483. Some material from chapter 3 has appeared previously in press as “The Spirit and the Scriptures: Revisiting Cyprian’s Use of Prosopological Exegesis,” *JECH* 8 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1080/2222582X.2018.1429941>.

*Kyle Hughes*  
Atlanta, Georgia  
Epiphanytide 2018



# List of Tables

1	Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to God/the Father in the writings of Justin	50
2	Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to Christ/the Lord/the Word in the writings of Justin	53
3	Old Testament passages ascribed to the Spirit in the writings of Justin	56
4	Elements of Justin's innovative pneumatology in the Johannine writings	86
5	Elements of Justin's innovative pneumatology in 1 Corinthians	90
6	Elements of Justin's innovative pneumatology in Hebrews	93
7	Elements of Justin's innovative pneumatology in key New Testament passages	94
8	Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to God/the Father in the writings of Irenaeus	123
9	Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to Christ/the Son/the Word in the writings of Irenaeus	126
10	Old Testament passages ascribed to the Spirit in the writings of Irenaeus	127
11	Comparison of <i>Haer.</i> 3.6.1 with related passages	130
12	Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to God/the Father/the Creator in the writings of Tertullian	168
13	Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to Christ/the Son/Wisdom in the writings of Tertullian	174
14	Old Testament passages ascribed to the Spirit in the writings of Tertullian	177
15	The Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit in Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian	207

# Abbreviations and Citations

References to primary sources use the abbreviated title and relevant numbering from a critical edition, which is always cited parenthetically alongside the ancient reference. Texts taken from critical editions may be lightly edited for consistency of formatting. All primary source translations are my own, unless otherwise noted. Abbreviations for primary texts and scholarly resources follow the conventions in *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). Alternate or additional abbreviations are provided below:

ASE	<i>Annali di storia dell'esegesi</i>
BAC	The Bible in Ancient Christianity
BETS	<i>Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
BGBH	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik
CCSA	Corpus Christianorum: Series Apocryphorum
ECF	The Early Church Fathers
EUS	European University Studies
FC	Fontes Christiani
JCP	Jewish and Christian Perspectives
JECH	<i>Journal of Early Christian History</i>
JPT	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i>
JPTSup	Supplements to Journal of Pentecostal Theology
JTI	<i>Journal of Theological Interpretation</i>
Lampe	G.W.H. Lampe, <i>Patristic Greek Lexicon</i>
MBT	Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie
ModTheo	<i>Modern Theology</i>
NAPSPMS	North American Patristic Society Patristic Monograph Series
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
PAST	Pauline Studies
PPS	Popular Patristics Series
PTMS	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
VCSup	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae

# Introduction

One striking continuity through most of Christian history is the relative inattention given to the Holy Spirit. Though Christians have professed belief in the Spirit from their earliest creeds and baptismal formulas through the present day, the content of that belief was and continues to be open to considerable interpretation. For instance, to take just one example from antiquity, the Nicene Creed of 325 C.E. gives a lengthy description of the collected bishops' opinion concerning the nature of Christ before simply asserting, "And [we believe] in the Holy Spirit."<sup>1</sup> The surprising brevity of this statement is often viewed as a reflection of a lack of precision or interest in the nature of the Holy Spirit among the writers of the New Testament and the early church. Likewise, the question of what precisely this belief in the Spirit entails is in many ecclesiastical quarters today a source of much contention and confusion, if not outright apathy, with attention instead focused on those doctrinal matters deemed to be more central for the life and worship of the church.<sup>2</sup> This era of pneumatological neglect, however, appears to be at an end. The phenomenal growth of Pentecostal-Charismatic movements, particularly in the non-Western world, has contributed to renewed interest in the biblical and historical foundations of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, recent scholarship, detailed below, has rightly demonstrated the profound importance of pneumatology in the development of early Christian theology and praxis. It is thus into this context that I put forward this book on one aspect of the development of early Christian pneumatology, and thereby participate in the efforts of both church and academy to more fully understand what it means for Christians, then and now, to "believe in the Holy Spirit."

This introduction will first provide a brief orientation to three areas of scholarship that are particularly relevant for this study, highlighting how these three areas can be brought into dialogue to generate a fresh approach to thinking about the development of early Christian pneumatology through the lens of what I will propose as the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. Having accom-

- 
- 1 For the full Nicene statement of faith, see John H. Leith, ed., *Creeds of the Church: A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present*, 3rd ed. (Louisville: John Knox, 1982), 31.
  - 2 On the theological challenges inherent in the modern study of pneumatology, see further Daniel Castelo, *Pneumatology: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 2–13.
  - 3 For overview and bibliography, see further Clark Pinnock, "The Recovery of the Holy Spirit in Evangelical Theology," *JPT* 13 (2004): 3–18.

plished this, the rest of this introduction will then set out the book's methodology and propose its scope before concluding with a brief overview of each of the chapters to follow.

## Orientation

This study will combine three areas of scholarship in the fields of New Testament and early Christian studies that have not yet been brought into conversation with one another: (1) the development of early Christian pneumatology; (2) the *topos* of divine testimony in the ancient world; and (3) the ancient reading strategy of prosopological exegesis. Below, I will set out the most important recent scholarly developments in each of these areas, as well as articulate my proposal for how they may be brought into dialogue with one another. Building on these foundations, this book will be well positioned to make a unique contribution to our understanding of one particular way in which three pre-Nicene Christian writers—Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Tertullian—utilized Scripture and the conventions of ancient rhetoric and exegesis to formulate a highly innovative approach to the Holy Spirit, an approach that would contribute to the eventual identification of the Spirit as the third person of the Trinity.<sup>4</sup>

### *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*

In telling the story of the development of pre-Nicene pneumatology, scholars of early Christian theology are in effect trying to connect two fixed points upon which, broadly speaking, they have found agreement.<sup>5</sup> The first fixed point is

---

4 My use of the English word “person” masks the differences between the Greek word *ὑπόστασις* and the Latin word *persona* as well as the development of these terms over time, to say nothing of contemporary philosophical debates about the nature of personhood. For a summary of the relevant issues with respect to the Spirit, see Bernd Oberdorfer, “The Holy Spirit—A Person? Reflection on the Spirit’s Trinitarian Identity,” in *The Work of the Spirit: Pneumatology and Pentecostalism*, ed. Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 27–46. As a work of historical theology, the task of this book is to track the developing understanding of “person” terminology from the perspective of the ancient writers themselves. In any event, the modern idea of a conscious, self-aware individual should not be read into ancient references to “personhood”; in general, I use the term “person” as referring to a being with a distinct identity, as opposed to something more akin to an impersonal energy or force.

5 This discussion of the development of early Christian pneumatology takes place, of course, within the debate about the broader process of the development of Trinitarian doctrine in the third and fourth centuries, a subject that is beyond the scope of this book. Recent influential monographs on this larger topic include Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to*

the absence of a single understanding of the Spirit in the New Testament, as these first Christian writers drew heavily on a wide range of contemporary Jewish pneumatological traditions.<sup>6</sup> References to the personhood of the Spirit are, at best, inconsistent and underdeveloped.<sup>7</sup> Regardless of how much of the

---

*Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Khaled Anatolios, *Retrieving Nicaea: The Development and Meaning of Trinitarian Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011). For an earlier, influential survey of the issues involved, see J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 3rd ed. (London: Black, 1965), 83–137, 252–279.

- 6 Though beyond the scope of this book, the topic of the Spirit in Second Temple and early rabbinic Judaism has been explored in great detail elsewhere; see especially Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, trans. and ed. John A. Baker, vol. 1 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), 117–146; Marie E. Isaacs, *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and Its Bearing on the New Testament* (London: Heythrop College, 1976), 1–64; John R. Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*, AGJU 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 27–211. Levison in particular cautions us against trying to identify one primary or consistent view of the Spirit for a given author or text in light of the sheer diversity of conceptions concerning the Spirit at this time (*Spirit in First Century Judaism*, 242). For an overview of the various ways that the Spirit is understood in the New Testament, see Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Holy Spirit—In Biblical Teaching, through the Centuries, and Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 33–160. Other key works on the Holy Spirit in the New Testament include Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament: A Study of Primitive Christian Teaching* (London: Macmillan, 1910); C.K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1958); James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1975); George T. Montague, *The Holy Spirit: The Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1976); Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup 54 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991); Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994); Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, JPTSUp 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
- 7 Part of the problem undoubtedly stems from Paul's use of impersonal language to describe the reception of the Spirit (cf. Rom 5:5; 2 Cor 1:22, 5:5; 1 Thess 4:8). Still, as Thiselton (*Holy Spirit*, 122) explains, "By *qualifying* personal language with 'dynamistic' language, Paul suggests that the Spirit is *more than personal, not less than personal. He is suprapersonal*" (italics original). Though Thiselton employs the masculine gender for the Spirit here, I concur with Castelo (*Pneumatology*, 10–12) that there is no reason, on grammatical grounds alone, to use male language to refer to the Spirit; as such, I choose to use gender-neutral pronouns in this book. Despite their popularity in many conservative circles, grammatical arguments in favor of the Spirit's personality based on gender and agency have been demonstrated to be unconvincing, as has been shown by Daniel B. Wallace, "Greek Grammar and the Personality of the Holy Spirit," *BRR* 13 (2003): 97–125. An argument for Paul's understanding of the work of the

doctrine of the Trinity one believes can be found in the New Testament, the language, if not the core ideas themselves, of the fourth-century ecumenical councils is largely absent.<sup>8</sup>

The second fixed point is the late-fourth-century confession of God as one nature or essence (μία οὐσία) in three persons or distinct individual beings (τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις), of which one was the Spirit. This definition, often referred to in the literature as the “Cappadocian settlement,” was formulated over the course of several decades of contentious and acrimonious debate concerning the nature of God. In particular, the second half of the fourth century saw a dispute among some Christians on the nature of the Spirit between, on the

---

Spirit as having been formed by relational terms, challenging the view that Paul instead drew on Stoic understandings of the Spirit as a material substance, can be found in Volker Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*, 2nd rev. ed., WUNT 2/283 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013). Rabens does not go so far as to say that Paul views the Spirit as a person, but describes Paul as viewing the Spirit as having “personal traits” (*Holy Spirit and Ethics*, 144–145). For a recent, influential work that does argue that Paul understood the Spirit as a person, see Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, 829–831; Fee emphasizes those verbs that require a personal agent as the subject. On the whole, I take it that Paul, over the course of his writings, evolves towards a more personal understanding of the Spirit, even as a more impersonal view coexists alongside of it. Still, I find the New Testament text that most clearly anticipates the pro-Nicene view of the Spirit to be the Gospel of John, where, even more clearly than in Paul, the Spirit is portrayed as personal, in large part thanks to the description of the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete. On the pneumatology of the Fourth Gospel, with special attention to the Paraclete sayings, see John Breck, *The Origins of Johannine Pneumatology*, vol. 1 of *Spirit of Truth: The Holy Spirit in Johannine Tradition* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1991); Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 350–357; Thiselton, *Holy Spirit*, 131–147; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John XIII–XXI*, AB 29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970), 639: “As the Paraclete, the Spirit takes on a more personal role than in many other sections of the NT.”

- 8 For various attempts to find the doctrine of the Trinity in the New Testament, see the proposals of, e.g., Arthur W. Wainwright, *The Trinity in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1962); Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom: The Doctrine of God*, trans. Margaret Kohl (London: SCM, 1981), 61–96; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994–1998), 1:259–270. See the summary in Thiselton, *Holy Spirit*, 122–129. Recent attempts to find evidence of Trinitarian thought in Paul include Ron C. Fay, “Was Paul a Trinitarian? A Look at Romans 8,” in *Paul and His Theology*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, PAST 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 327–345; Andrew K. Gabriel, “Pauline Pneumatology and the Question of Trinitarian Presuppositions,” in *Paul and His Theology*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, PAST 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 347–362. The argument of this book in some ways parallels the proposals of David S. Yeago, “The New Testament and the Nicene Dogma: A Contribution to the Recovery of Theological Exegesis,” *ProEccl* 3 (1994): 152–164; C. Kavin Rowe, “Biblical Pressure and Trinitarian Hermeneutics,” *ProEccl* 11 (2002): 295–312.

one hand, the “pro-Nicenes,”<sup>9</sup> who affirmed the full divinity of the Spirit, and, on the other, a group termed the “*pneumatomachoi*,”<sup>10</sup> who confessed the full divinity of the Son but not of the Spirit, the latter of whom they believed to be a creature.<sup>11</sup> The most influential pro-Nicene response came in the form of Basil of Caesarea’s *On the Holy Spirit* (375 C.E.), the first extant treatise exclusively devoted to the doctrine of the nature of the Spirit. Basil defended the view that the Spirit was to be glorified together with the Father and with the Son, and was thus likewise divine.<sup>12</sup> Basil’s work influenced the writing of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (381 C.E.),<sup>13</sup> and it also provided the basis for further influential explorations of the nature of the Spirit by Gregory of

9 On the meaning of “Pro-Nicene,” see Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, 236–240.

10 That is, the “Spirit-fighters,” though it is important to note that this title was given to them by their pro-Nicene opponents; they are also at times referred to as Macedonians after Macedonius the bishop of Constantinople. The extent to which the *pneumatomachoi* were in fact a unified group as opposed to a convenient heresiological construction masking genuine diversity remains an open question. In any event, the *pneumatomachoi* appear to have originated in Asia Minor in the late 360s and early 370s C.E. under the leadership of Eustathius of Sebaste, who had once been a mentor of Basil of Caesarea. As for the Anomoean leader Eunomius of Cyzicus, one of Basil’s primary opponents, it appears most likely that Eunomius was not himself a member of the *pneumatomachoi* but nevertheless—at least in Basil’s mind—held a view of the Spirit roughly equivalent to what that group was teaching. See further Michael A.G. Haykin, *The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*, VCSup 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 9–49; Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, 211–218.

11 An important prior debate concerning the nature of the Spirit took place in the late 350s when a group of Egyptians likewise confessed the full divinity of the Son but not of the Spirit. In response to these so-called “*Tropikoi*,” Athanasius argued that the Spirit is not a creature but rather a distinct and fully divine person, consubstantial with the Father and the Son, as at *Ep. Serap.* 1.28 (PG 26:593–595).

12 For an overview of *On the Holy Spirit* and Basil’s pneumatology, see Stephen M. Hildebrand, *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 173–187. See further Haykin, *Exegesis*, 104–169.

13 The relevant portion of this creed declares belief in “the Holy Spirit, the Lord and life-giver, Who proceeds from the Father, Who is worshiped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, Who spoke through the prophets.” Text from Leith, *Creeeds of the Church*, 33. On the Creed of Constantinople and its view of the Spirit, see further Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy*, 253–260; Anatolios, *Retrieving Nicaea*, 26–27. As Ayres (*Nicaea and Its Legacy*, 258) notes, the absence of the term *homoousios* with respect to the Spirit provided an ambiguity that “enabled it to serve not only as a negotiating tool to draw in as many Homoiousians and ex-Homoiousians as possible, but also as a cipher for the robustly pro-Nicene theology of a Gregory of Nyssa.”

Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa, who are often credited with the “one nature, three hypostases” formula referenced above that identified distinctions among the divine persons on the basis of origin and mutual relation.<sup>14</sup>

Given these two generally accepted fixed points, scholars have disagreed in their understanding of how to draw the line connecting the ambiguity of the New Testament’s pneumatology to the carefully defined articulation of the Spirit’s place in the Trinity by the end of the fourth century. On the traditional understanding of the development of early Christian pneumatology, scholars have assumed a slow and steady trajectory of theological refinement that culminated in the classic expression of the orthodox creeds, with the pre-Nicene period in general cast as lacking a developed theology of the Spirit.<sup>15</sup> This basic narrative is found in almost all summaries of the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.<sup>16</sup>

- 
- 14 There is some controversy whether this precise formula should be attributed to the Cappadocians, as this exact phrase is relatively rare in their writings, though see, e.g., Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.* 21.35, 39.11 (SC 270:184–186; SC 358:170–172). For a complete discussion of the issue, see further Joseph T. Lienhard, “*Ousia* and *Hypostasis*: The Cappadocian Settlement and the Theology of ‘One Hypostasis,’” in *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity*, ed. Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O’Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 99–121. In any event, it was this “Cappadocian settlement” that would set the basis for later orthodoxy. To return to the above issue of “personhood,” there continues to be a great deal of debate concerning what the Cappadocians meant by Trinitarian personhood in the first place; see further John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1985); Lucian Turcescu, “‘Person’ versus ‘Individual,’ and Other Modern Misreadings of Gregory of Nyssa,” *ModTheo* 18 (2002): 527–539; Aristotle Papanikolaou, “Is John Zizioulas an Existentialist in Disguise? Response to Lucian Turcescu,” *ModTheo* 20 (2004): 601–607; Brian E. Daley, “‘One Thing and Another’: The Persons in God and the Person of Christ in Patristic Theology,” *ProEccl* 15 (2006): 17–46. For a general overview of debates over the meaning of Trinitarian personhood, both ancient and modern, see Paul M. Collins, *The Trinity: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 52–94.
- 15 This view was also articulated in antiquity among pro-Nicene writers such as Gregory of Nazianzus; cf. *Orat.* 31.26 (SC 250:326–328).
- 16 For this standard narrative, see, e.g., Adolf Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. Neil Buchanan, 7 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1896–1905), 4:108–110; J.F. Bethune-Baker, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon* (London: Methuen, 1903); Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1912), 5–6; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)*, vol. 1 of *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 211–225; Stanley M. Burgess, *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions* (Peabody, MA:



While it is true that the Spirit only became the subject of intense theological speculation in the fourth century, this standard narrative masks the genuine diversity and innovation that took place in earlier centuries.<sup>17</sup> A new account of the development of early Christian pneumatology, therefore, has been advanced in recent years, most prominently in the work of Lewis Ayres and Michel René Barnes,<sup>18</sup> with the published dissertations of some of Barnes's students also contributing to this new approach.<sup>19</sup> Their revised schema divides the history of early Christian pneumatology into three stages, which will be briefly summarized on account of this approach's relevance for this book.

In the first stage, a more precisely articulated version of the first fixed point described above, the view of the Spirit articulated by many early Christian writers generally "receives, continues and develops" various Jewish approaches to the Spirit.<sup>20</sup> In other words, during this period there is evidence of an early "high" pneumatology that drew on ideas that already existed within Judaism. Among the most significant of these ideas were the notions of the Spirit as

- 
- Hendrickson, 1984), 12–14; Gregg R. Allison, *Historical Theology: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 430–449. For an alternative history that focuses not on the belief in but rather the experience of the Holy Spirit in the ancient church, see the valuable contribution of John Eifion Morgan-Wynne, *Holy Spirit and Religious Experience in Christian Literature ca. AD 90–200* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006).
- 17 In addition, this account of the development of pneumatology easily falls into the "trajectories" model of early Christianity by positing the existence of an original "orthodox" Christianity that then developed largely independently of any external factors. This approach is rightly criticized by Larry Hurtado, "Interactive Diversity: A Proposed Model of Christian Origins," *JTS* 64 (2013): 445–462.
  - 18 This proposal was most succinctly advanced in the series of articles published by Lewis Ayres and Michel René Barnes, "Pneumatology: Historical and Methodological Considerations," *AugStud* 39 (2008): 163–236. This collection includes four papers, as well as an introduction and conclusion, which were originally presented at the annual meeting of the North American Patristics Society in 2005.
  - 19 See especially Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); building off of the work of both Barnes and Briggman, see Jackson Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity*, VCSup 127 (Leiden: Brill, 2014). Other scholars of early Christian pneumatology have also embraced this schema; see, e.g., Mark DelCogliano, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayres, trans. and intro., *Athanasius and Didymus: Works on the Spirit*, PPS 43 (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011), 11–15.
  - 20 Michel René Barnes, "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology," *AugStud* 39 (2008): 170. Barnes's work is in some respects a retrieval of the work of Christian Oeyen. See, e.g., Bogdan G. Bucur, "Revisiting Christian Oeyen: 'The Other Clement' on Father, Son, and the Angelomorphic Spirit," *VC* 61 (2007): 381–413.

Creator, as an Angel, as Wisdom, and as the Consort of God.<sup>21</sup> The writings of Irenaeus, according to this schema, represent the high point of this stage of pneumatological reflection, with Jewish traditions and Christian doctrine being interwoven into a complex, creative synthesis.<sup>22</sup>

In the second stage, this Jewish-Christian pneumatology was abandoned by third-century writers such as Tertullian and Origen, who, in response to the threat of monarchianism, attempted to more clearly distinguish between the Son and the Spirit by developing a distinctively Christian pneumatology “on the basis of other theological superstructures.”<sup>23</sup> In the course of subordinating the Spirit to the Son, texts that had previously been thought to describe the Spirit (e.g., those speaking of Wisdom) were instead applied to the pre-incarnate Son.<sup>24</sup> The rejection of Jewish-Christian forms of theology, therefore, had the result of creating a “lower” pneumatology during this period.<sup>25</sup> This in turn reduced the number of acceptable ways for conceiving of the Spirit, and yet it also set the foundation for the developments of subsequent centuries.<sup>26</sup>

Indeed, in the third stage of this schema, which begins in the middle of the fourth century, focus on the unity of the Godhead led to a recovery of some of the approaches to the Spirit found in the first stage, even as this process of retrieval generated a new series of clashes and further theological refinement.<sup>27</sup>

- 
- 21 Barnes, “Beginning and End,” 170–180. Barnes helpfully provides numerous examples from early Christian sources: for Creator pneumatology, e.g., Athenagoras, *Leg.* 6.3 (PTS 31:32); Theophilus, *Autol.* 1.7.3 (PTS 44:24); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.6.1 (SC 153:72); *Epid.* 5 (SC 406:90); for Angel pneumatology, e.g., *Ascen. Isa.* 9:36 (CCSA 7:416–417); for Wisdom pneumatology, e.g., Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.20.3–4 (SC 100:632–636); for Consort pneumatology, e.g., the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, as quoted in Origen, *Comm. John* 2.87 (SC 120:262).
  - 22 This emphasis on the Jewishness of early pneumatology seems in many ways parallel to movements that aim to recover the Jewishness of Jesus himself, as is characteristic of the so-called “third quest” for the historical Jesus.
  - 23 Barnes, “Beginning and End,” 170. Specifically, this new superstructure is that of order (*taxis* or *gradus*); cf. Barnes, “Beginning and End,” 184–186; Tertullian, *Prax.* 2.4, 30.5 (FC 34:106, 252); Origen, *Princ.* 1.3.5 (SC 252:152–154); *Comm. John* 2.75 (SC 120:254–256).
  - 24 Barnes, “Beginning and End,” 183; cf. Tertullian, *Prax.* 6–7 (FC 34:120–128); Origen, *Princ.* 1.2.9 (SC 252:128–130).
  - 25 Barnes, “Beginning and End,” 184. On Tertullian’s rejection of Jewish-Christian theology, see further Jean Daniélou, *The Origins of Latin Christianity*, trans. David Smith and John A. Baker, vol. 3 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1977), 139–188.
  - 26 Lewis Ayres and Michel René Barnes, “Conclusions,” *AugStud* 39 (2008): 235.
  - 27 Ayres and Barnes, “Conclusions,” 235; cf. Lewis Ayres, “Innovation and *Ressourcement* in Pro-Nicene Pneumatology,” *AugStud* 39 (2008): 187–206.

For instance, the view of the Spirit as Creator, rejected in the writings of Tertullian and Origen, resurfaces in the context of fourth-century pneumatological debate within the writings of several pro-Nicene theologians.<sup>28</sup> It is ultimately Augustine, according to this schema, whose writings represent the pinnacle of the post-Nicene view of the person and work of the Spirit.<sup>29</sup>

In sum, the significance of this new narrative of the development of early Christian pneumatology for this book is the recognition that the first two centuries were not unimportant for the future development of thinking about the Spirit; on the contrary, the various innovations in these early centuries were critical foundations for later developments. Moreover, this approach helps us to recognize the enormous diversity of early Christian pneumatologies that were in currency at this time and to note that the proto-orthodox position was by no means the inevitable one during these centuries. Though scholars have continued to modify this basic approach,<sup>30</sup> it nevertheless appears to be the new paradigm for thinking about the development of early Christian pneumatology and will serve as an important dialogue partner for the conclusions generated by this study.

### *The Topos of Divine Testimony*

Having positioned this study in the history of research concerning the development of early Christian pneumatology, we now turn to consider an aspect of rhetorical criticism that will be important for formulating the central argument of this book. Building off of the work of earlier scholarship concerning the ancient concept of the *topos* (τόπος; Latin *locus*),<sup>31</sup> James McConnell has recently explored the function of the *topos* of divine testimony in Luke-Acts. With particular relevance for our purposes, McConnell provides a survey of

28 Ayres, "Innovation and *Ressourcement*," 194–197; pro-Nicene theologians who recovered the notion of Spirit as Creator include Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose, and Nicetas of Remesiana.

29 Ayres and Barnes, "Conclusions," 236; cf. Lewis Ayres, "*Spiritus Amborum*: Augustine and Pro-Nicene Pneumatology," *AugStud* 39 (2008): 207–221; Michel René Barnes, "Augustine's Last Pneumatology," *AugStud* 39 (2008): 223–234.

30 E.g., Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 1–4, 204–205.

31 See especially John C. Brunt, "More on the *Topos* as a New Testament Form," *JBL* 104 (1985): 495–500, which corrected earlier views on the matter by appealing to actual ancient rhetorical handbooks; more recently, see Johan C. Thom, "'The Mind Is Its Own Place': Defining the *Topos*," in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White, *NovTSup* 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 555–573.

the writings of ancient rhetoricians and concludes that the ancient sense of the term included an understanding of a *topos* as “a source of proofs, used in composing a speech for the purposes of defending or prosecuting one accused of some crime.”<sup>32</sup> Within this forensic understanding of *topos*, McConnell is particularly interested in what Cicero calls external arguments and what Aristotle terms inartificial proofs, which depend not on what is particular to the subject matter being argued but rather on sources outside the case itself, such as the testimony of witnesses or authorities. In light of Cicero’s dictum that “external arguments depend principally on authority,” it comes as no surprise, McConnell argues, that the ancient rhetoricians believed divine testimony to be a particularly persuasive source of such proofs and used them liberally in speeches and treatises of similar genre to the texts that will be analyzed in this book.<sup>33</sup>

Though McConnell’s work focuses on Hellenistic narratives in general and Luke-Acts in particular, his analysis of how the *topos* of divine testimony functioned in antiquity is nevertheless helpful for guiding this project. First, McConnell distinguishes among various forms of divine testimony, focusing on the broad groups of “utterances” and “deeds.”<sup>34</sup> It is the former group, that of divine testimony through utterances, with which we will concern ourselves in this book, and so we will consider this portion of McConnell’s work in more detail. McConnell demonstrates that in Hellenistic narratives divine testimony through utterances could take the form of outright divine speech, the words of an inspired intermediary, or the words of oracles. McConnell goes on to note that while in every case the general use of this form of divine testimony was to portray a character as either pious or impious, the specific purposes of the testimony in a given narrative could also include encouraging, affirming, commanding, or warning a character; alternatively, it could explain a divine act or provide a prophecy that would later be fulfilled.<sup>35</sup>

With this in mind, McConnell examines how divine testimony through utterances functions in Luke-Acts, and observes one very interesting phenomenon. Luke, it appears, has replaced the Greco-Roman category of oracles with quotations from and allusions to the Hebrew Bible, which is understandable in

32 James R. McConnell Jr., *The topos of Divine Testimony in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014), 24.

33 McConnell, *Divine Testimony*, 38; cf. Cicero, *Top.* 4.24 (LCL 386:396).

34 McConnell (*Divine Testimony*, 1) traces the distinction between “utterances” (that is, instances of speech) and “deeds” (that is, instances of actions or physical events) to Acts 1:1, which refers to both what Jesus did and what he taught.

35 McConnell, *Divine Testimony*, 120.

light of the Jews' belief in the divine inspiration of their sacred texts.<sup>36</sup> Indeed, McConnell argues, Luke's audience would have understood his use of Scripture in the same way that Greco-Roman readers would have understood their writers' use of oracles; both would be recognized as divine speech and both would often, albeit not always, be prefaced by introductory statements.<sup>37</sup> McConnell concludes that in Luke-Acts, as in Hellenistic writing, divine testimony through utterances has the aforementioned central purpose of characterizing someone with respect to that person's piety or lack thereof; in other words, the rhetorical purpose of this kind of testimony is to enable the audience "to experience the divine perspective of the character in question."<sup>38</sup> Implicit in Luke's appeal to this form of testimony is the notion that because the testimony is from the God that they worship and view as reliable and true, by extension the testimony itself is reliable and true, and therefore of great value.<sup>39</sup> As our study progresses, therefore, we will want to be attentive to this particular rhetorical feature of early Christian texts related to the Spirit. In particular, we will pay close attention to when this *topos* is extended or transformed so that a divine being (in our case, the Spirit) is not merely showing approval or disapproval of a human character but actually testifying to the divinity or lordship of other beings. This latter usage, which I will call the *Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit* to distinguish from the standard *topos* of divine testimony, will in fact be at the center of this book in the following chapters.<sup>40</sup>

To further clarify this distinction between divine testimony and Trinitarian testimony, we may briefly consider the example of the words spoken at Jesus's

---

36 McConnell, *Divine Testimony*, 121.

37 McConnell, *Divine Testimony*, 174.

38 McConnell, *Divine Testimony*, 176.

39 On the notion of truth in the New Testament and the ancient world, see further Rudolf Bultmann, "ἀλήθεια καὶ," *TDNT* 1:232–251.

40 As will be further developed, the use of the term "Trinitarian" is, to varying extents, anachronistic when applied to the theology of the pre-Nicene writers examined in this book; still, the term is used as an illuminating if imperfect label for those circumstances in which the Spirit is portrayed as testifying to the divinity and lordship of the Father and/or the Son. It is, as I will argue, precisely because this form of testimony so clearly *anticipates* the development of later Trinitarian theology that I have chosen a terminology reflecting this important later theological development. My usage matches that of other recent works on second- and third-century Christian writers that have similarly employed the label "Trinitarian" to describe aspects of their theology while acknowledging its deficiencies; recent works reflecting this usage in their title include Anthony Briggman, "Measuring Justin's Approach to the Spirit: Trinitarian Conviction and Binitarian Orientation," *VC* 63 (2009): 107–137; Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity*.

baptism. In this account (Mark 1:10–11 pars.), the Holy Spirit descends on Jesus as a voice from heaven speaks to him the words of Ps 2:7, “You are my son.”<sup>41</sup> McConnell, analyzing the Lukan version of Jesus’s baptism, notes that this is an instance of the *topos* of divine testimony, suggesting that an ancient audience would have most likely understood this scene as an instance of such testimony both through the actions of a bird of divine origins as well as through the utterances of a heavenly voice; in sum, this scene is establishing a deity’s approval of a character in the narrative (in this case, God’s approval of Jesus).<sup>42</sup> While this is a textbook example of the *topos* of divine testimony, we may note, first, that the Spirit’s role is relegated to being the mere symbolic means by which the Father testifies to Jesus; the Spirit is not itself presented as the testifying agent, much less in a way that conveys upon it any degree of unique personhood. Second, we may observe that this is not an instance of Trinitarian testimony insofar as the divine speech does not have to do with ascribing deity or lordship; contrary to how later Christians would read this text, it is almost certain that the use of “son” in Ps 2:7 and its application in Mark 1:10–11 pars. is as a royal, and not ontological, term highlighting Jesus’s identity not as the pre-existent second person of the Trinity but as the Davidic Messiah.<sup>43</sup> In this book, our interest will instead focus on those texts in which the Spirit itself provides testimony for the specific purpose of ascribing deity and lordship to other beings.

### *Prosopological Exegesis*

A final line of scholarship with which this book will extensively engage is the study of the ancient reading strategy of prosopological exegesis.<sup>44</sup> As the history of scholarship concerning prosopological exegesis has been more than sufficiently treated elsewhere,<sup>45</sup> this section will focus more specifically on how preceding works have treated the subject of prosopological exegesis with respect to the Holy Spirit.<sup>46</sup> The study of prosopological exegesis, which seeks

41 The differences in the Synoptic accounts of Jesus’s baptism are beyond the scope of this book; see any commentary for detail, e.g., Joel Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, AB 27 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 161.

42 McConnell, *Divine Testimony*, 232–235.

43 See, e.g., Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 162.

44 This term also appears in older literature as “prosopographical exegesis,” but following modern convention I will use the term “prosopological exegesis.” See further Matthew W. Bates, *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul’s Method of Scriptural Interpretation* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012), 186.

45 See, for instance, Bates, *Hermeneutics*, 183–187.

46 For the related rhetorical device of prosopopoeia, as distinct from prosopological exegesis

to identify various “characters” or “persons” (Greek *πρόσωπα*; Latin *personae*) as speakers or addressees of texts in which they are otherwise ambiguous, was first applied in detail to the study of the New Testament and early Christian writings by Carl Andresen (1961).<sup>47</sup> Andresen’s primary contribution was to demonstrate how the Trinitarian notion of person was not, contra Harnack, merely an innovation of later writers such as Tertullian and Hippolytus, but rather the result of a certain way of reading Scripture that developed during the very beginnings of the Christian movement.<sup>48</sup> While this central thesis was influential for all subsequent works on prosopological exegesis in early Christianity, Andresen’s argument concerning the Spirit’s role in this process proved more controversial. We will therefore need to pause to consider this specific aspect of his argument in more detail.

Andresen believed that Justin and Irenaeus did not present the Spirit as a prosopological speaker,<sup>49</sup> so he found it all the more striking that, as heir to their interpretive tradition, Tertullian did present the Spirit as a “trinitarischer Gesprächspartner.”<sup>50</sup> Indeed, Andresen observed that in *Against Praxeas* 11, Tertullian, following the interpretive tradition he inherited, cites Ps 2:7 and Ps 110:3 as evidence of dialogue between the Father and the Son; later in *Prax.* 11, Tertullian circles back to Ps 110, but this time uses 110:1 as an example of the Spirit speaking as its own person. This, however, differed from both Justin and Irenaeus, who in Andresen’s accounting merely presented the Spirit as the inspiring agent behind the words of Scripture.<sup>51</sup>

---

as defined herein, see Stanley K. Stowers, “Apostrophe, Προσωποποιία and Paul’s Rhetorical Education,” in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White, NovTSup 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 351–369; Bates, *Hermeneutics*, 194–199.

47 Carl Andresen, “Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffes,” *ZNW* 52 (1961): 1–39.

48 Michael Slusser, “The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology,” *TS* 49 (1988): 462.

49 With reference to *Dial.* 56.14–15 (PTS 47:164–165), Andresen (“Zur Entstehung,” 19) writes that Justin seems to think the Spirit “hier ist an den Inspirationsgeist, der durch David spricht, gedacht, nicht aber die trinitarische Person gemeint”; likewise, “Das gilt übrigens auch für Irenäus” in *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:64–68).

50 Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 19–20. Here Andresen cites approvingly the comment of Ernest Evans, ed. and trans., *Tertullian’s Treatise against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (London: SPCK, 1948; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 256: “There appears to be no parallel to Tertullian’s suggestion that the Holy Spirit refers here to the Son as ‘my Lord.’”

51 Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 19.

How, though, did this development come about? Andresen focused on the history of interpretation of Ps 110 in the early church and suggested that we can distinguish between two streams of interpretation. On the one hand, the psalm often appears in arguments designed to prove that Jesus is the Christ and the true referent of Old Testament prophecy. On the other hand, some early Christian authors instead focused on the dialogical aspect of the psalm, considering the relationship of the divine persons to one another.<sup>52</sup> When, however, the early Christians began to draw upon the reading strategy of prosopological exegesis, this created theological pressures insofar as they had the potential to be understood as suggesting that the speaker was merely a fictional character and not a real divine person. In response, they crafted increasingly careful introductory formulas and more freely mixed the two types.<sup>53</sup> This, however, led to some degree of uncertainty or flexibility with respect to the relation between the Spirit and Scripture. According to Andresen, in none of the Christian authors before Tertullian is there evidence of the Spirit speaking as an interlocutor in conversations among divine persons; rather, “Die Möglichkeit der Selbstaussage für eine trinitarische Person bleibt dem Sohn vorbehalten und wird nicht auf den Geist ausgedehnt.”<sup>54</sup> It was Tertullian, however, who first recognized that prosopological exegesis could be used to include the Holy Spirit in what may now be referred to as a genuinely Trinitarian conversation. As Andresen explained,

Des Rätsels Lösung darin zu sehen, daß der nordafrikanische Theologe im kühnen Griff aus der bisherigen Anwendung der Zitationsformel für die prosopographische Exegese die Folgerung zog, daß in bestimmten Sprüchen der heilige Geist sich als trinitarische Person selbst manifestiere.<sup>55</sup>

What, though, motivated Tertullian to link traditional prosopological exegesis with the Trinitarian concept of person? Andresen credited the influence of

---

52 Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 20. For a more complete study of the use of Ps 110 in early Christianity, see David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*, SBLMS 18 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1973). Hay does not, however, engage with Andresen, nor does he analyze how or why some early Christian interpreters assigned the words of Ps 110:1 to the Spirit.

53 Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 21.

54 Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 22–23.

55 Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 23.



Montanism and drew a contrast between Tertullian's more literal exegesis and the more spiritual exegesis of his predecessors, including Justin.<sup>56</sup>

Andresen's article, besides being the first scholarly attempt to show how early Christian writers made use of the ancient literary technique of prosopological exegesis to find evidence of distinct divine persons in the Old Testament, was also the first attempt to account for texts in which the Spirit seems to speak from its own person. That being said, as we will see, Andresen's contribution is in need of substantial refinement on this latter point. First, his claim that Tertullian was the first to have the Spirit speaking prosopologically has come under increasing criticism (see below). In large part, this is the result of Andresen not adequately providing a method by which to distinguish between when the Spirit merely inspires a biblical author or prophet and when the Spirit actually speaks as its own person. Second, and as a result of his mistakenly selecting Tertullian as the innovator of this particular pneumatological idea, Andresen's historical reconstruction of the process by which the Spirit came to take on this role will need to be revised. Third, Andresen left a number of other questions about the Spirit's relationship with prosopological exegesis unanswered. For instance, Andresen did not consider why Tertullian chose certain Old Testament quotations, and not others, to have been spoken by the Spirit. Finally, Andresen did not take up the question of the extent to which theological ideas embedded in the New Testament may have played a role in shaping this particular view of the Spirit's person and work. Thus, while Andresen's work provides an important foundation for this study, these many unanswered questions provide openings for this book to break new ground by proposing answers that challenge, revise, or expand upon Andresen's work.<sup>57</sup>

The next major study of prosopological exegesis with particular relevance for the specific issue of the Spirit's prosopological speech is that of Marie-Josèphe Rondeau (1985).<sup>58</sup> While most of Rondeau's work was devoted to ana-

---

56 Andresen, "Zur Entstehung," 24.

57 A negative evaluation of Andresen's article is found in Joseph Moingt, *Théologie trinitaire de Tertullien*, 4 vols. (Paris: Aubier, 1966–1969), 2:558–559. Moingt's critique centers on the fact that later pro-Nicene writers do not use "la formule ἀπὸ προσώπου," but the fact that historical developments altered the terminology used to describe the divine persons does not negate the many points of continuity between, for instance, ἀπὸ προσώπου and *ex persona* as terms used to invoke prosopological exegesis; likewise, Slusser ("Exegetical Roots," 463 n. 12) finds Moingt's criticisms "Procrustean."

58 Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier Recherches et bilan*, 2: *Exégèse prosopologique et théologie* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1985).

lyzing prosopological exegesis in Origen and later writers, her comments on the Spirit's ability to speak prosopologically echo those of Andresen:

Mais le trait de génie de Tertullian va être de montrer que dans certains versets du dossier sur lequel il argumente, l'Esprit non seulement présente le Père et le Fils comme un 'je' et un 'toi', ou un 'je' et un 'lui', ou un 'toi' et un 'lui', mais, par le biais d'un adjectif possessif de la première personne qui révèle qu'il parle aussi en son propre nom, se présente lui-même comme locuteur divin faisant nombre avec les deux autres: troisième locuteur divin, troisième personne de la Trinité.<sup>59</sup>

Like Andresen, therefore, Rondeau claimed it was Tertullian's "trait de génie" that elevated the Spirit in this way.

Rondeau did, in her brief treatment of this topic, go beyond Andresen by addressing one aspect of the nature of the texts in which Tertullian had the Spirit speak from its own person: "Il est remarquable que, discernant dans l'Ecriture la preuve que l'Esprit est la 'troisième personne' divine, Tertullien tire cette preuve non de textes où l'Esprit serait un 'lui', mais de textes où il est lui-même un 'je' articulé au couple 'je-tu' formé par le Père et le Fils."<sup>60</sup> In other words, Tertullian identified the Spirit as a third divine person when the Spirit speaks as an "I" alongside the "I" and "you" of the Father/Son relationship. Though this grammatical insight was helpful, it still did not get at the nature of the Old Testament quotations themselves, a major task of this book, nor did Rondeau pursue this topic any further in a way that would otherwise expand on Andresen's contribution to this particular issue.

The study of prosopological exegesis did not significantly break into English-language scholarship until the publication in 1988 of an influential article by Michael Slusser entitled "The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology." As with Andresen and Rondeau, the vast majority of Slusser's contribution focused upon the influence of prosopological exegesis on the development of Christology. As for its effect on the development of early Christian pneumatology, Slusser took a much more minimalistic view:

Apart from a very few texts of Tertullian [...], the Holy Spirit does not appear as an interlocutor within the texts we have seen examined by prosopological exegesis. Instead, the Spirit is the source of all the utter-

59 Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques*, 31–32.

60 Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques*, 33 n. 41.

ances of Scripture, even those in which the Father or the Word express themselves ‘in their own person.’ As the one who speaks all the words, including those spoken as by the persons of the Father, Son, the people of Israel, and everyone else, the Spirit never attains the personal definition of the others; and yet, if by *prosōpon* is meant ‘the one who speaks and concerning whom he speaks and to whom he speaks,’ the dignity, if not the clear definition, cannot be denied to the Holy Spirit.<sup>61</sup>

Thus, for Slusser, even in Tertullian’s writings the Spirit struggled to gain clarity as a divine person on the same level as the Father and the Son. Slusser did, however, attempt to provide a biblical grounding for the development of this form of prosopological exegesis, pointing to Acts 7:55–56 as a text that may have inspired such Trinitarian distinctions. In this passage, Stephen, full of the Holy Spirit, looks into the heavens where he sees the Father and the Son; as Slusser put it, “There two persons are recognized, and the declaration springs from a divine impulse somehow distinct from them both.”<sup>62</sup> Thus, to the extent that the Spirit is merely a “divine impulse” lacking the personal definition of the Father and the Son, Slusser saw little progress beyond this view of the Spirit even into Tertullian’s time.

The topic of prosopological exegesis has recently received new attention in light of the publication of a pair of important works on the subject by Matthew Bates. Bates’s *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation* (2012) and *The Birth of the Trinity* (2015) stand as the first monographs in the English language devoted to the use of prosopological exegesis in early Christianity. The chief innovation of Bates’s work is the application of the insights of a careful study of prosopological exegesis to the reading of the New Testament, as previous works on prosopological exegesis had almost exclusively focused on its presence in later Christian writings. Specifically, in *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation*, Bates argues that Paul extensively utilizes prosopological exegesis over the course of his letters, and claims that paying attention to how Paul employs this particular reading strategy can untangle many of the thorniest exegetical difficulties in the Pauline corpus.<sup>63</sup>

61 Slusser, “Exegetical Roots,” 476.

62 Ibid.

63 Bates, *Hermeneutics*, 223–328. If there is one weakness of Bates’s argument at this point, it is that he often focuses on the use of prosopological exegesis to the exclusion of other reading strategies that may also be at work in these passages. For a more holistic approach to early Christian hermeneutics that includes prosopological exegesis, see the comments

In *The Birth of the Trinity*, Bates expands his view to encompass the rest of the New Testament, arguing that “prosopological exegesis contributed decisively to the development of the concept of the Trinity, since it was this way of reading that especially led to the consolidation of ‘person’ language to express the three-in-one mystery.”<sup>64</sup> The notion that prosopological exegesis played a significant and heretofore underappreciated role in the development of Trinitarian thought was, of course, a key feature of Andresen’s landmark article, but whereas Andresen focused only on Tertullian and the writers who followed him, Bates identifies evidence of the same reading strategy across much of the New Testament. Bates takes special note of how the Gospel writers present Jesus as interpreting the Old Testament prosopologically, even suggesting that the historical Jesus himself may have utilized this method; thus, the early Christians’ development of the doctrine of the Trinity may have grown out of Christ’s own method of reading the Hebrew Scriptures.<sup>65</sup>

As important as these contributions are, Bates’s most important insight for the purposes of this book is his reevaluation of the role of the Spirit in early Christian prosopological exegesis. In contrast to the aforementioned views of Andresen, Rondeau, and Slusser, Bates contends that “the Holy Spirit was regarded at least by the time of Justin Martyr (the middle of the second century) as a distinct person capable of speaking in the theodrama on his own, not just in the guise of another.”<sup>66</sup> Despite this claim, Bates provides surprisingly little attention to the ways in which, for the earliest Christian writers, the Spirit participates in the theodrama (a term that will be defined below) as its own person, rather than just as the one who supplies or inspires the words spoken by the other divine persons. Bates does point to two texts in Justin Martyr that

---

of Stephen O. Presley, *The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Irenaeus of Lyons*, BAC 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 3–5.

64 Matthew W. Bates, *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 7. The importance of scriptural exegesis in the development of Trinitarian theology has also been described by Mark Edwards, “Exegesis and the Early Christian Doctrine of the Trinity,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, ed. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 80–91.

65 Bates, *Birth*, 203. This particular point has been the subject of some criticism; see, e.g., James F. McGrath, review of *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament*, by Matthew W. Bates, *RBL* (2016). I largely agree with McGrath’s criticism of this point; as I will argue in this book, the real contributions of prosopological exegesis to the development of Trinitarian theology are made by Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian.

66 Bates, *Birth*, 164–165.

he believes indicate that the Spirit could speak in this way (*Dial.* 36.6, 56.14–15), thus moving beyond the work of Andresen, Rondeau, and Slusser, each of whom found evidence of the Spirit speaking prosopologically only as early as Tertullian.<sup>67</sup>

While this is a helpful corrective, Bates still does not attempt an explanation of why the Spirit was put forward as the true speaker of these particular Old Testament texts. Indeed, while the vast majority of *The Birth of the Trinity* concerns dialogues between the Father and the Son, the Spirit's full participation in dialogue with the other divine persons receives little more than a few pages over the course of the entire work.<sup>68</sup> Likewise, a recent article by Anthony Briggman on Justin's view of the Spirit also gives a brief acknowledgement of the likelihood that the Spirit speaks prosopologically in Justin's *Dialogue* but makes little effort to explain Justin's usage or to compare similar passages in later Christian authors.<sup>69</sup>

Finally, Bates introduces some terminology that will be helpful for this book. First, he uses the language of "theodrama" to describe "the dramatic world invoked by an ancient reader of Scripture as that reader construed a prophet to be speaking from or observing the person (*prosōpon*) of a divine or human character."<sup>70</sup> Specifically, then, prosopological exegesis refers to those instances in which the human prophet actually takes on the role of a divine person and, within the theodramatic setting, speaks or is spoken to as that character.<sup>71</sup> Thus,

67 Bates (*Birth*, 165) cites these texts from Justin only by way of suggesting that the unidentified speaker of Heb 1:8–9, which like *Dial.* 56.14–15 (PTS 47:164–165) cites Ps 45:6–7 (LXX 44:7–8), is "probably" the Spirit, assuming "continuity in hermeneutical logic" between the author of Hebrews and later Christian authors.

68 The extent that Bates engages with the issue of the Holy Spirit as a distinct speaking person is effectively limited to *Birth*, 163–165.

69 Briggman, "Justin's Approach," 113–114. This article was reprinted, with only minor changes, in Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 9–31. Other recent articles on prosopological exegesis have not addressed the role of the Spirit in any detail; see Andrea Villani, "Origenes als Schriftsteller: ein Beitrag zu seiner Verwendung von Prosopopöie, mit einigen Beobachtungen über die prosopologische Exegese," *Adamantius* 14 (2008): 130–150; Stephen O. Presley, "Irenaeus and the Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology," in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*, ed. Paul Foster and Sara Parvis (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 165–171.

70 Bates, *Birth*, 5 n. 8. One significant aspect of using the language of theodrama is that it reminds us that the "person" language involved in prosopological exegesis is ultimately a metaphor; as Bates (*Birth*, 38) puts it, "when we speak of divine persons as revealed through scriptural interpretation, the *quality* of personhood envisioned is necessarily metaphorically determined" (*italics original*).

71 Bates, *Birth*, 35.

in the case of Ps 2:7, which we indicated above is an excellent example of the *topos* of divine testimony, Bates argues that the earliest Christians read this text prosopologically, with David taking on the character of the Son as he reports what the Father had spoken to him at an earlier time (“The Lord God said to me, ‘You are my son ...’”), thereby suggesting multiple theodramatic moments.<sup>72</sup> In this book, we will be particularly interested in the theodramatic setting of Old Testament texts insofar as these texts are interpreted with respect to the Spirit and its relationship with the Father and the Son.<sup>73</sup>

Second, Bates distinguishes between when the Spirit functions as a “primary speaking agent” and when it functions as an “inspiring secondary agent,” with the former, we will demonstrate, conferring a unique degree of personhood upon the Spirit.<sup>74</sup> This study will attempt to further refine these categories by taking into account some of the other questions concerning how the Spirit speaks prosopologically that were not addressed in Bates’s work. In particular, I will identify one subset of prosopological speech that I am calling *intra-divine dialogue*; by this, I refer to those instances in which the words of the Old Testament that are being interpreted prosopologically are spoken by one divine person to or about another divine person. Though most examples of prosopological speech do not involve other divine persons, we will discover that such dialogue between and about divine persons is a central concern of this book, for it is in a prosopological reading of these biblical quotations that we find the clearest extension of the *topos* of divine testimony that we are calling the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit.

---

72 Bates, *Birth*, 62–79. That is, there is both the moment when the Son reported the Father’s words to him as well as the moment when the Father actually spoke those words to the Son.

73 Bates (*Birth*, 34–36) distinguishes this theodramatic setting from both the “prophetic setting,” in which the prophet spoke the words in the character of a divine person, as well as the “actualized setting,” in which the theodramatic words are actually performed. I likewise follow Bates (*Birth*, 35) in distinguishing the broader category of theodramatic interpretation from prosopological exegesis, which he views as a subset of the former in which the prophet moves beyond merely observing conversation among the speaking persons to actually participating as the speaker or audience of theodramatic texts.

74 Bates, *Birth*, 164 n. 18. It is unclear whether or not Bates intends us to understand the Spirit’s function as an inspiring secondary agent to be a form of prosopological exegesis, but to the extent that a writer chooses to explicitly identify the Spirit as the speaker (in any capacity) of an Old Testament text wherein it is not otherwise in view, we could reasonably label this a type of prosopological exegesis, albeit a diminished one in which the personality of the Spirit is considerably diminished.

Third, Bates argues in favor of an approach to the development of the doctrine of the Trinity that he terms “Trinitarianism by continuity in prosopological exegesis,” by which he means that prosopological exegesis contributed the fundamentally important (if nevertheless always metaphorical) language of “person” that would come to be accepted as “the premier divinely authorized way to parse and differentiate identities and relationships with respect to the one God.”<sup>75</sup> While there is of course a clear evolution of how “person” is to be understood from Justin to Tertullian to the Cappadocians, there is nevertheless an essential continuity linking the identification of multiple divine persons speaking in Scripture with the identification of multiple divine persons in the Trinity.<sup>76</sup> This book seeks to take this model of Trinitarianism by continuity in prosopological exegesis and evaluate it, as Bates largely does not do, with respect to the development of the understanding of the Spirit as a divine person.

In sum, despite the recent growth of scholarly interest in prosopological exegesis, only the most minimal attention has been given to the Spirit; as we have seen, even those scholars who believe that the Spirit can speak prosopologically have not provided a systematic analysis of these texts or an explanation for the logic behind them. Thus, in this book, I wish to go beyond these scholars who have identified the key texts in which the Spirit speaks prosopologically by delving deeper into the nature of the quotations spoken by the Spirit as a primary speaking agent and by attempting to identify both exegetical and historical reasons for this development, thereby contributing additional nuance and complexity to scholarly understanding of the development of pre-Nicene pneumatology (and, by extension, Trinitarian theology). This book therefore seeks to answer the following central questions: On what basis could early Christian writers appeal to the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, and what forms could this testimony take? How did early Christian understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit develop over time in light of each successive writer’s specific theological and historical context? What implications do these findings have for modern scholarly inquiry into the development of early Christian pneumatology? Likewise, what implications do these findings have for modern scholarly inquiry into the place of prosopological exegesis in early Christianity?

Having surveyed the entire corpus of ante-Nicene Christian writings, it is clear that the majority of the most important texts for answering these ques-

---

75 Bates, *Birth*, 26–27, 203.

76 Cf. Bates, *Birth*, 36–40, 174–175.

tions are those in which the Spirit speaks prosopologically from its own person, although there are also some texts that shed light on these questions in other ways. The aim of this book is to analyze and synthesize all of these texts and to draw conclusions about how and why the early Christian understanding of the Spirit's testifying role to the other divine persons developed over the course of this period, thus providing answers to the guiding questions above.

As a result of this inquiry, as I plan to demonstrate, we will have a new window by which to view the theological dynamics at work in the pre-Nicene period that would contribute to the development of a distinctively Trinitarian, and not merely binitarian, view of God. Furthermore, by setting these theological developments in their historical contexts, we will have an additional window by which we can better glimpse one aspect of the process by which early "orthodox" Christians developed a self-identity distinct from that of Judaism or of competing "heretical" forms of the Christian faith.

### Methodology

This book employs what might be termed a "problem-oriented" exegetical method, beginning with a close reading of the primary source texts that takes problems as they come, applying the appropriate methodological tools to each given situation. As such, this method is both diachronic, insofar as it will at times ask the traditional historical-critical questions concerning the source history and *Sitz im Leben* of a given document, as well as synchronic, to the extent that it will at other times require us to analyze the grammar or argumentative structure of a text itself. Issues of genre and social background will also feature heavily throughout this work. Often we will find it helpful to engage in comparison between authors or between texts. It is only by drawing upon this wide assortment of exegetical tools, I believe, that we will be fully equipped to set out into our exploration of the development of this particular aspect of early Christian pneumatology. With our attention to prosopological exegesis and the *topos* of divine testimony, however, it is clear that this book is perhaps most indebted to developments in the field of rhetorical criticism as part of a broader scholarly project to read ancient Christian texts in light of the rhetorical and exegetical conventions of their day and to consider the effects that these strategies would have had on their audiences.<sup>77</sup>

---

77 Some of the works that I have found particularly helpful in thinking about the relationship between ancient rhetoric and New Testament or early Christian exegesis include George



One particular aspect of this book's methodology calling for special attention, as it will be utilized throughout this work, concerns how to gauge the influence of one text or author on another text or author. Especially in those cases in which literary dependence is unlikely or too difficult to prove, there is a need for clearly articulated criteria that can be used to explain how the ideas in different texts relate to one another. Following Richard Hays and other scholars working with what is sometimes called intertextuality, there are established criteria to help measure the plausibility of one early Christian writer having influenced another, including availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, and explanatory power.<sup>78</sup> Following one line of scholarship,<sup>79</sup> I find availability and volume to be the two most important

---

A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984); Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*, HUT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991); idem, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*, HUT 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians, and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

78 Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29–32. Hays's methodology has been highly influential in subsequent studies of intertextuality in the New Testament; see, e.g., Kenneth D. Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*, JSNTSup 282 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 61–65; Brian J. Abasciano, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:1–9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis*, LNTS 301 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 22–24; Leroy A. Huizenga, *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew*, NovT-Sup 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 58–65. While later generations of Christians continued to read Scripture intertextually, as noted by Young (*Biblical Exegesis*, 130–139) and Presley (*Intertextual Reception*, 1–12), one important difference between considering the influence of the Old Testament on the New Testament and the influence of early Christian texts on other early Christian texts has to do with the fluidity of the boundary between oral and textual transmission. Scholars are increasingly recognizing that a literary paradigm, such as that which characterizes the modern Western world, is not appropriate for understanding the ancient world. This insight has recently been extensively applied to the study of the transmission of the Jesus tradition and the composition of the Gospels, highlighting how the Jesus tradition circulated orally not only prior to but also alongside of the written Gospels. See further, e.g., James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003); Terence C. Mournet, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependence: Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q*, WUNT 2/195 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010).

79 See, e.g., Robert L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*

criteria for establishing the likelihood of influence, with the other criteria serving in more of a supplementary role. Of course, the specific context and nature of the texts under consideration will affect the exact manner in which these criteria are applied and weighted.<sup>80</sup>

A second foundational aspect of this book's methodology concerns some of the presuppositions that I bring to the study of early Christianity. On the most basic level, this book assumes the scholarly deconstruction of terms such as "orthodoxy" and "heresy," recognizing that the historical record has been shaped, in both ancient and modern times, by agendas that do not take into account the full complexity of the various social, political, and theological factors that contributed to the creation of an "orthodox" Christian identity.<sup>81</sup> Moreover, I take it as a given that ancient texts do not so much objectively describe the religious landscape of the period as they do construct it; in particular, I presuppose that texts often construct dividing lines that are almost certainly not reflective of the fluidity and flexibility that characterized ancient religious identity.<sup>82</sup> As a result, in this book I assume a considerable level of exchange, contact, and influence among various groups, agreeing with Heidi Marx-Wolf that "efforts to delineate clear, impermeable, and inflexible boundaries between such groups as Christians, Jews, Hellenes, Gnostics, and so forth

---

(Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, 63–64; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 13–14.

80 On this point, see especially Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, "Reflections on Method: What Constitutes the Use of the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers?" in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 61–82. Though the texts studied in this book are dated after at least most of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, many of the problems involved in identifying references to New Testament texts in the absence of formal markers are similar.

81 The scholarly deconstruction of traditional notions of orthodoxy and heresy is generally traced to Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971); trans. of *Rechgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im älteren Christentum*, BHT 10 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934).

82 Some of the foundational texts for this approach to early Christian studies include Miriam S. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*, StPB 46 (Leiden: Brill, 1995); Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Judith Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Greco-Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). On problems with the term "religion" in antiquity, see James B. Rives, *Religion in the Roman Empire* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 13–53.

are, by their nature, problematic and anachronistic.”<sup>83</sup> Our study of the development of early Christian pneumatology, therefore, will be attentive to the ways in which these theological ideas came to be formulated through the process of dialogue and polemic with groups that were later excluded from what was designated as Christian orthodoxy.

In terms of the scope of this book, I have decided to limit my focus to the period ca. 150–220 C.E., the age of the early Christian apologists.<sup>84</sup> The chief reason for this is that having examined all Christian texts written before the Council of Nicaea, I found that it was only in this period that the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit emerged in any meaningful way on account of the writings of Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian. With reference to the aforementioned process of early Christian self-definition, these three writers shared a keen interest in the right interpretation of the Hebrew Bible as a part of their literary efforts to distinguish and legitimize proto-orthodox forms of Christianity with respect to Judaism, traditional Greco-Roman religious beliefs, and “heretical” forms of

---

83 Heidi Marx-Wolf, *Spiritual Taxonomies and Ritual Authority: Platonists, Priests, and Gnostics in the Third Century C.E.*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 4.

84 For most scholars, the era of the apologists begins ca. 125 C.E. with Quadratus, but in any event Justin is the first apologist to leave substantial written records that are extant today. Irenaeus and Tertullian may perhaps be more properly categorized as heresiologists, but the distinction between an apologist and a heresiologist is not an ancient but a modern one; the great apologist Justin wrote a non-extant book against heresies, and the famed heresiologist Tertullian wrote a traditional apology. I thus use the terms “apologist” and “apology” somewhat expansively to include aspects that other scholars might prefer to distinguish as heresiological in nature. On whether or not “apologetic” is a distinctive genre, see the overview of Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price, “Introduction: Apologetics in the Roman World,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 1–13, as well as the competing views of the various contributors to that volume. For instance, whereas Edwards et. al. (“Introduction,” 1) define apologetic as “the defence of a cause or party supposed to be of paramount importance to the speaker,” Frances Young, “Greek Apologists of the Second Century,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 91, argues, “‘Apology’ is not a genre, but properly the end or purpose of a speech, particularly a speech for the defence in court.” See further Silke-Petra Bergian, “How to Speak about Early Christian Apologetic Literature? Comments on the Recent Debate,” *StPatr* 36 (2001): 177–183; Stuart E. Parsons, *Ancient Apologetic Exegesis: Introducing and Recovering Theophilus’s World* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2015), 76–77.

the Christian faith.<sup>85</sup> This common purpose thereby provides a unifying characteristic across all of the writings we will survey in this book. More specifically, however, each of these three writers was concerned with defending a certain view of Jesus and his relationship with the Father on the basis of true, valid witness (e.g., the *topos* of divine testimony) and proper interpretive principles (e.g., prosopological exegesis). Even more narrowly, we will see that each of these writers used a prosopological reading of the Old Testament to identify the Holy Spirit as the provider of divine testimony to the deity and lordship of the Father and of the Son.<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, to the extent that these three writers all stand in a common stream of influence, we can evaluate, for each of these early Christian writers, the extent to which there are continuities and discontinuities with respect to their views of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit.<sup>87</sup>

As with the choice of any time period for historical investigation, the choice of Justin and Tertullian as the outer limits of the bulk of this study is to some extent arbitrary, but I do believe this is a logical choice for setting the boundaries of this book. On the front end, Justin's writings represent the first real attempt to find evidence of the Spirit speaking prosopologically through the writings of the Old Testament. Justin is also generally considered the first great apologist for whom we have extant writings, and as such is a logical starting

---

85 For an overview of Christian apologists and their literature from this period, see, e.g., Robert M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1998); Young, "Greek Apologists," 81–104; Simon Price, "Latin Christian Apologetics: Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Cyprian," in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 105–129. As noted by Daniel Boyarin, "Justin Martyr Invents Judaism," *CH* 70 (2001): 438, "The self-definition of Christianity against Judaism and the self-definition of orthodoxy against heresy are closely linked, for much of that which goes under the name of heresy in these early Christian centuries consists of one variety or another of Judaizing, or alternatively, of straying too far from Jewish roots."

86 These three writers have often been treated together in the literature because they all share certain key theological assumptions, such as their articulation of Logos-theology as the basis of their Christology; see further Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 145–152.

87 Thus Origen, whose Alexandrian tradition represents a different trajectory of early Christian theology, will not be a major focus of this book. While not discounting the significance of Origen's contributions to the development of early Christian pneumatology, the fact that Origen does not use prosopological exegesis to portray the Spirit as a primary speaking agent further sets him apart from the other writers studied in this book. As noted in the conclusion of this book, one important avenue for further research would be to set the conclusions of this study alongside analyses of Origen's contribution to the development of early Christian pneumatology.

point for surveying this period. Though the New Testament writers and the Apostolic Fathers develop the link between the Spirit and testimony in ways that will set the stage for later Christian writers, the period prior to Justin is best treated as background for the study itself. Thus, where applicable, material from the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers will be considered in order to illuminate aspects of the pneumatology of the time period under review in this book. The latter boundary brings us to the death of Tertullian, the greatest of the early Latin apologists. Tertullian's writings also give us the final strong connection between the Spirit's speech and Trinitarian testimony, making Tertullian a fitting close to the main line of argument in this book. However, just as the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers provide important background for our study, so also the writings of later figures, such as Cyprian, Novatian, and the Cappadocians, will be briefly explored as the foreground for this study in order to illustrate what is particularly distinctive and influential about the period 150–220 C.E. Though not the central focus of this book, we will want to at least briefly consider why this particular theological trajectory seems to fade from view after the time of Tertullian and consider the legacy that these writers' pneumatological innovations left on subsequent generations of Christian theologians.

### Plan

The following chapters will trace the development of the link between the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony diachronically, examining in turn the writings of Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian before making some general conclusions that synthesize the results of our findings in light of the guiding questions posed above.

In chapter 1, we will examine the writings of Justin Martyr as the first major source of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Spirit for the purpose of providing Trinitarian testimony. Though Justin's views on the Spirit are often described as confused in light of his seeming failure to distinguish between the Spirit and the Word, we will discover that Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56 (and, to a lesser extent, in *Dial.* 36) personalizes the Spirit in ways that forge a meaningful link between the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony. We will then analyze the extent to which this particular innovation should be credited to Justin as opposed to his sources, engaging with the work of Oskar Skarsaune on Justin's use of *testimonia* collections. Our next task will then be to consider some of the historical and theological factors that may have shaped this development, examining in turn the potential impact of Justin's engagement with Judaism,

Marcionism, and Greco-Roman philosophy. From there, we will take up the question of the extent to which Justin may have been influenced by New Testament ideas in elucidating this view of the Spirit, focusing on relevant pneumatological ideas present in the Johannine writings, Paul, and Hebrews. This chapter concludes with a reappraisal of the significance of Justin's pneumatology for later pro-Nicene writers and thus a reevaluation of scholarly narratives for the development of early Christian views of the Spirit.

In chapter 2, we will evaluate the writings of Irenaeus of Lyons as the second major source of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Spirit for the purpose of providing Trinitarian testimony. We will first analyze how Irenaeus's presentation of this issue, set out most clearly in *Haer.* 3.6.1, compares with that of his predecessor Justin. We will then consider how Irenaeus's broader theological schema, emerging most directly from his conflict with Valentinian Gnosticism, utilized the notion of the divine economy to further develop the Spirit's role in providing testimony to the Father and the Son. This chapter also concludes with a brief reflection on the legacy of this aspect of Irenaeus's pneumatology and its significance for our understanding of the development of early Christian views of the Spirit.

In chapter 3, we will consider the works of Tertullian of Carthage as a third source of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Spirit for the purpose of providing Trinitarian testimony. We will first evaluate the extent to which Tertullian's approach to this topic, as found in *Prax.* 11, compares with that of his predecessors Justin and Irenaeus. We will then analyze how Tertullian's redefinition of the divine economy further refined the Spirit's work of providing Trinitarian testimony, considering the role of the New Prophecy in influencing and motivating Tertullian's unique articulation of this topic. Following this, we will examine the extent to which key figures in the Latin tradition—namely, Cyprian and Novatian—may have been influenced by Tertullian's presentation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. This chapter then concludes with a consideration of Tertullian's pneumatological legacy among pro-Nicene writers and its implications for scholarly reconstructions of the development of early Christian pneumatology.

Lastly, we will conclude this book by answering the guiding questions set out above on the basis of the preceding chapters. We will also set out some implications of this study for scholarly inquiry into prosopological exegesis and the development of pre-Nicene pneumatology before providing some final suggestions for further research.

## Justin and the Emergence of the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit

In this chapter, we will consider the figure of Justin Martyr, often thought to be the greatest of the early Christian apologists.<sup>1</sup> Per the overall focus of this book, this chapter will examine how Justin conceived of the relationship between the Spirit and testimony to other divine persons, with special attention to a key passage in chapter 56 of his *Dialogue with Trypho* (ca. 160 C.E.). Specifically, we will discover that Justin uses prosopological exegesis to personalize the Spirit in ways that prove enormously influential for later writers. In identifying and bringing to light Justin's surprising role as a catalyst for later Christian reflection on the person and work of the Spirit, we will be better positioned to understand Justin's contribution to the development of what will ultimately become a Trinitarian understanding of God. In the following pages, we will not only identify the precise nature of Justin's new approach to the Spirit but also consider the historical, theological, and exegetical influences that may have encouraged Justin to make this particular innovation. As a result, by the end of this chapter, we will be in a position to challenge the traditional perspective on Justin's importance for the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

First, however, we must briefly sketch how recent scholarship has understood Justin's view of the Holy Spirit. As Anthony Briggman has adeptly observed, many previous attempts to describe Justin's pneumatology have suggested that Justin's reasoning concerning the Spirit was simply confused but have not persuasively explained the reason for this lack of clarity or precision

---

1 See, e.g., Eric F. Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, BHT 47 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973), 13. For biographical information concerning the life of Justin, see Henry Chadwick, "Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity," *BJRL* 4 (1965): 275–278; L.W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 4–13; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 6–10; Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*, VCSup 64 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 28–31; David Rokéah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews*, JCP 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 1–2; Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, eds. and trans., *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*, OECT (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 32–33. For a recent summary of the state of Justin scholarship, see Michael Slusser, "Justin Scholarship: Trends and Trajectories," in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 13–21.

with respect to the Spirit.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, there is more specifically something of a consensus around the position that Justin appears to confuse the function, if not also the identity, of the Spirit and the Logos.<sup>3</sup> This confusion of the Spirit and the Logos can be seen, for instance, in the fact that, at times, Justin attributes the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets to “the prophetic Spirit” (τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα)<sup>4</sup> and, at other times, to the Logos.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, Justin does seem to understand the Spirit as a distinct divine entity, third in rank (χώραν, which could also be translated as “place” or “position”) after God the Father and the Logos,<sup>6</sup> named alongside the Father and the Son in liturgical formulas,<sup>7</sup> and worthy of worship.<sup>8</sup> This language of rank is consistent with the widely used subordinationism characteristic of pre-Nicene Christian theology with respect to both the Spirit and the Son.

- 2 Anthony Briggman, “Measuring Justin’s Approach to the Spirit: Trinitarian Conviction and Binitarian Orientation,” *VC* 63 (2009): 107–108. This article was reprinted, with only minor changes, in idem, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 9–31.
- 3 So, e.g., Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1912), 38–39; Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923; repr., Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968), 180–185, 235–236; Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 102–105; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 88–89. See further Briggman, “Justin’s Approach,” 107 n. 1, for thorough bibliography.
- 4 See, e.g., *1 Apol.* 61.13 (SC 507:292). On this distinctive term in Justin’s writings, see further Graham N. Stanton, “The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen Barton (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 326–329; Stanton (“Spirit,” 327) concludes that the phrase “the prophetic Spirit” may in fact have been coined by Justin himself.
- 5 See, e.g., *1 Apol.* 36.1 (SC 507:224); *2 Apol.* 10.8 (SC 507:350). On Justin’s “binitarian tendency,” see Briggman, “Justin’s Approach,” 114–123. The passage most likely to be cited in favor of the view that Justin also confused the identities of the Spirit and the Logos (that is, that they were merely two names for the same person) is *1 Apol.* 33.6 (SC 507:218), but this need only mean that the Logos can be described as “Spirit,” as in Lam 4:20; cf. Minns and Parvis, *Justin*, 66; Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 104; Stanton, “Spirit,” 331. Though some (e.g., Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 88; Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 180) have seen *1 Apol.* 33.9 (SC 507:220) as a particularly strong piece of evidence for the unity of the Spirit and the Logos, see now the translation of Minns and Parvis at *1 Apol.* 33.9 and their comment at 175 n. 5.
- 6 *1 Apol.* 60.6–7 (SC 507:286).
- 7 *1 Apol.* 61.3, 65.3, 67.2 (SC 507:290, 304, 308). On these “triadic” statements, see Stanton, “Spirit,” 329–331.
- 8 *1 Apol.* 6.2 (SC 507:142). On Justin’s Trinitarian convictions, see Briggman, “Justin’s Approach,” 111–114. On the distinctive activity of the Spirit in Justin, see Susan Wendel, “Interpreting the Descent of the Spirit: A Comparison of Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* and Luke-Acts,” in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 95–103.



How, then, can we account for Justin's apparent confusion of the Spirit and the Logos? Erwin Goodenough's influential explanation was that Justin seemed to think of the Spirit, at least at times, as an aspect or activity of the Logos, an idea that would have been perfectly intelligible in the Jewish-Hellenistic milieu of the times.<sup>9</sup> As for L.W. Barnard, Justin's theology leaves no room for the Spirit insofar as the Logos performs all the functions of the Spirit; nevertheless, Justin maintained a belief in the Spirit on account of his Christian experience and worship.<sup>10</sup>

Most recently, Briggman has suggested that the real problem is that Justin is caught between an inherited theology that is essentially binitarian and a liturgy that is essentially Trinitarian, giving rise to an unclear identity and function for the Spirit and hence the claims of modern scholars.<sup>11</sup> The reason for this tension is that Justin wrote during what was a transition period in the history of the development of early Christian theology, before the later doctrine of the Trinity had been fleshed out with distinct identities for both the Son and the Spirit.<sup>12</sup>

To understand Briggman's argument, it must first be recognized that Justin categorized the Word and the Spirit among the class of heavenly "powers" (δυνάμεις), a category that originated in pre-Christian Judaism as some Jews began to speak of a "second power" in heaven.<sup>13</sup> This attempt to preserve monotheism even while allowing for the existence of additional heavenly beings such as angels (who were nevertheless not identical or equal to the one true God) would provide the language for many early Christians, Justin included, to

9 Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 180–188; along the same lines see Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 104–106.

10 Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 106.

11 Briggman, "Justin's Approach," 108–109. For evidence of Justin's Trinitarian convictions, Briggman points to the triadic statements of faith noted above.

12 Briggman, "Justin's Approach," 123.

13 By most accounts, the earliest extant example of this is the "son of man" figure in Daniel 7, a text normally dated to the Maccabean period. See further Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*, SJLA 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1977), esp. 159–205 on the evidence from Hellenistic Judaism. The influence of this on the development of Christology is best developed by Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988). On Hurtado's view, the first Christians interpreted their belief in Jesus's exaltation in terms of pre-existing notions within Judaism of heavenly figures or divine agents who acted on God's behalf in significant ways, though, of course, they transformed previous views of this type by making Jesus the center of their religious life and devotion.

describe both the Word and the Spirit.<sup>14</sup> Because this approach assumes that the Word and the Spirit share certain characteristics with the angels, the literature often refers to this particular approach to the Spirit as an “angelomorphic pneumatology.”<sup>15</sup> Briggman thus suggests that it is precisely because the Word and the Spirit are both part of this same class of heavenly powers that they can be conflated into what many scholars have termed a “Spirit-Christology,” which identifies the Holy Spirit with the pre-incarnate Christ and therefore leads to the functional overlap between the two that has caused such difficulty in assessing Justin’s understanding of the Spirit.<sup>16</sup>

Justin’s reliance on an angelomorphic pneumatology indicates that Justin was more speaking the language of early Judaism and the New Testament than he was the carefully articulated definitions that would characterize post-Nicene Christianity. After all, the base theological conception of “holy spirit” in the minds of early Jews and Christians was, as F.W. Horn puts it, not of a distinct person so much as “the manifestation of divine presence and power perceptible especially in prophetic inspiration.”<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, Justin’s writings, as we will see, at times also contain evidence of a more personal understanding of the Spirit that, I will argue, is a key development in the trajectory of Trinitarian thought. To anticipate the argument to follow, it will be necessary to carefully distinguish between the most significant speaking functions of the Spirit and consider how they relate to the issue of the extent to which Justin portrays the Spirit as a distinct divine person.

As such, for the purposes of our study, we will want to focus on those places in which Justin does in fact attribute to the Spirit a distinctive function or identity that pushes the concept of “holy spirit” in the direction of *the* Holy Spirit, a shift that will set the stage for the pro-Nicene understanding of the third person of the Trinity. Thus, while scholars have focused, nearly exclusively, on Justin’s emphasis on the Spirit’s role in inspiring the Hebrew prophets and leading Christians into piety,<sup>18</sup> this chapter is more interested in following up on

---

14 Briggman, “Justin’s Approach,” 124–125.

15 For a definition and history of the term “angelomorphic pneumatology,” see further Bogdan G. Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*, VCSup 95 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), xxv–xxvii.

16 Briggman, “Justin’s Approach,” 126–128. For a similar approach to Justin’s angelomorphic pneumatology, see also Bogdan G. Bucur, “The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity: Justin, the Martyr and Philosopher,” *JR* 88 (2008): 190–208 (this article is reprinted and slightly revised in Bucur, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, 139–155).

17 F.W. Horn, “Holy Spirit,” *ABD* 3:260.

18 Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 186–187; Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 102–105; Stanton,

Briggman's suggestion that Justin distinguishes the activity of the Spirit "by attributing to it a special role in testifying to the deity of the Father and the Son."<sup>19</sup> Though Briggman does not develop this idea in much detail, it contains the seeds of an understanding of the Holy Spirit as a more clearly distinct divine person (at least with respect to its role in the divine theodrama), and as such will be the focus of the next section of this chapter, to which we now turn.

### Justin and the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit

Indeed, as Briggman claims, Justin identifies a unique, distinctive role for the Spirit with respect to its act of testifying to the Father and the Son. Briggman identifies *Dial.* 56.14–15 as the text that demonstrates his claim about this special testifying role of the Spirit. In context, this passage appears in response to Trypho's challenge that Justin prove from Scripture that the Word is in fact a second God or Lord besides the Creator (cf. *Dial.* 55.1). After citing Gen 19:23–25, Justin makes the following argument to Trypho:

"It is not only because of this [quotation]," I said, "that it is in every way necessary to admit that, besides the one considered Maker of all things, some other was called 'Lord' by the Holy Spirit—not only through Moses, but also through David, when he said, *The Lord says to my Lord: Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool* [Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1)], as I have quoted before. And again in other words, *Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; the scepter of your kingdom is a scepter of uprightness. You have loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows* [Ps 45:6–7 (LXX 44:7–8)]. Tell me, then, if you think that the Holy Spirit calls another 'God' and 'Lord' besides the Father of all things and his Christ."<sup>20</sup>

---

"Spirit," 326–334. Cf. Mark Edwards, "Exegesis and the Early Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, ed. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 83: "From Justin we learn nothing about the distinctive powers and attributes of the Third Person, except that he is the source of prophecy."

19 Briggman, "Justin's Approach," 113.

20 *Dial.* 56.14–15 (PTS 47:164–165): Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο, ἔφη, μόνον, ὅπερ ἦν, ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου ὁμολογεῖν ἔδει ὅτι παρὰ τὸν νοούμενον ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων καὶ ἄλλος τις κυριολογεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος· οὐ μόνον δὴ διὰ Μωσέως, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ Δαυίδ. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ δι' ἐκείνου εἴρηται· Λέγει ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου, ὡς προείρηκα. Καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις· Ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ θεός, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος· ῥάβδος εὐθύ-

Taken together, then, Justin identifies Gen 19:23–25, Ps 110:1, and Ps 45:6–7 as scriptural evidence for his belief in the distinction between the Word and the Father as two divine beings. These texts are often called “two powers” texts because many early Christian writers used them to prove the existence of a second divine person. Significantly for this study, however, Justin attributes these quotations to the Holy Spirit.<sup>21</sup> As Briggman concludes, “Thus, the Holy Spirit holds a unique position of importance, since his activity stands behind the texts of scripture that Justin uses to illustrate the divinity of the Father and his Word.”<sup>22</sup>

While Briggman’s analysis adequately summarizes the Spirit’s role in *Dial.* 56.14–15, he devotes less than a single page to the intriguing notion that the Spirit has a special role in testifying to the deity of the Father and the Son, doing very little to validate it or to analyze why Justin makes this particular move. Indeed, this passage generates a number of questions: What reading strategy is Justin applying to the Old Testament to create this particular interpretation? To what extent is the Spirit’s role of thus testifying distinctive? Was this in fact Justin’s innovation, or should we attribute it to one of his sources? What historical or theological contexts may have led Justin to articulate this particular view of the Spirit? What New Testament ideas may have influenced Justin?

It is the purpose of this section to answer each of these questions, taking them in turn; thus, we begin with introducing the subject of prosopological exegesis. First, we need to make sense of the reading strategy that Justin is employing in *Dial.* 56.14–15. This will require both a general overview of prosopological exegesis in antiquity as well as a summary of Justin’s own comments on his use of this interpretive method. With this foundation set, we will then proceed to analyze how Justin reads the Old Testament prosopologically in *Dial.* 56.14–15, with special attention to how he utilizes the Spirit in this process.

---

τητος ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου. Ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου, ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιᾶσεως παρὰ τοῦς μετόχους σου. Εἰ οὖν καὶ ἄλλον τινὰ θεολογεῖν καὶ κυριολογεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν φατε ὑμεῖς παρὰ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, ἀποκρίνασθέ μοι.

- 21 Though Justin’s quotation of Gen 19:23–25 is not introduced as the words of the Spirit, the backward-looking start to *Dial.* 56.14 (“Not only because of this quotation [i.e., Gen 19:23–25]” is it the case that “some other was called Lord by the Holy Spirit”) strongly implies that Gen 19:23–25 is meant to be understood in the same way as the subsequent quotations.
- 22 Briggman, “Justin’s Approach,” 114. In particular, Briggman’s statement that the Spirit “stands behind the texts of scripture” is vague and could be interpreted in a number of different ways.

### *Justin's Use of Prosopological Exegesis*

Justin, like other early Christian writers, adopted many of the exegetical practices that were used in the Greco-Roman schools of that time.<sup>23</sup> The Latin rhetor Quintilian has left us a textbook describing the various steps by which a *grammaticus* would attempt to properly interpret a text. The first step, in light of the fact that ancient Greek texts lacked word division and punctuation and often differed from manuscript to manuscript, was to establish an agreed upon text from which interpretation could proceed. The second step, then, was to consider the language itself, a process that involved analyzing parts of speech, explaining foreign or multivalent words, and unpacking figures of speech or aspects of style.<sup>24</sup>

One specific portion of this initial linguistic analysis involved identifying various persons or characters (Greek *πρόσωπα*; Latin *personae*) as speakers or addressees within a given text.<sup>25</sup> To take just one example from a classic writer, Quintilian in his *Institutes of Oratory* 9.2.29–37 describes the rhetorical device of prosopopoeia (*προσωποποιία*), in which a speaker may “provide appropriate characters for words of advice, reproach, complaint, praise, or pity,” such that “we are even allowed in this form of speech to bring down the gods from heaven or raise the dead; cities and nations even acquire a voice.”<sup>26</sup> Sometimes the speakers or addressees of such in-character speech are explicitly named, but in other instances “one can have an imaginary speech with an undefined speaker.”<sup>27</sup>

23 See further Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), *passim*, but especially 47–116.

24 Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 77–78.

25 On the use of prosopopoeia in the ancient rhetorical setting, see further Matthew W. Bates, *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 31–32; idem, *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Interpretation* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012), 194–199; Stanley K. Stowers, “Apostrophe, Προσωποποιία, and Paul's Rhetorical Education,” in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White, NovTSup 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 351–369; Brian C. Small, *The Characterization of Jesus in the Book of Hebrews*, BibInt 128 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 140–144. Some later progymnasmatists instead use the term ethopoeia (ἠθοποιία); cf. Small, *Characterization of Jesus*, 142–143.

26 *Inst.* 9.2.30–31 (LCL 127:50; trans. Russell). Further ancient progymnasmata related to prosopopoeia can be found in George A. Kennedy, trans., *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, WGRW 10 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

27 *Inst.* 9.2.36 (LCL 127:52; trans. Russell).

The problem of identifying this latter form of in-character speech is particularly acute in the case of a written text, because unlike in performative contexts a text cannot modulate its voice or change masks to demonstrate a shift in speaker.<sup>28</sup> As such, we can understand the emergence of what we might term prosopopoeiaic exegesis as ancient interpreters assigned a likely speaker or addressee to a text in which one or both of these roles was believed to be unclear.<sup>29</sup> Surviving texts from the worlds of both classical antiquity and early Judaism indicate that this method of literary and grammatical analysis was widely employed and easily recognized.<sup>30</sup>

Bringing this into the world of early Christianity, the belief that the divine Logos was a participant in many of the ambiguous dialogues of the Hebrew Bible allows us to speak more narrowly of prosopological exegesis, which Matthew Bates defines as follows:

Prosopological exegesis is a reading technique whereby an interpreter seeks to overcome a real or perceived ambiguity regarding the identity of the speakers or addressees (or both) in the divinely inspired source text by assigning nontrivial prosopa (i.e., nontrivial vis-à-vis the “plain sense” of the text) to the speakers or addressees (or both) in order to make sense of the text.<sup>31</sup>

As Bates notes, Justin’s clearest articulation of his use of prosopological exegesis comes in chapter 36 of his *1 Apology* (ca. 155 C.E.).<sup>32</sup> In fact, the entirety of *1 Apol.* 36–45 may be best described as “a necessary hermeneutical excursus,” providing the framework for how Christians understand much of the Old Testament.<sup>33</sup> Justin gives an overview of this method and of this entire section in *1 Apol.* 36.1–2:

28 On the use of a mask (πρόσωπον) in ancient drama as a background to prosopological exegesis, see Bates, *Hermeneutics*, 192–194.

29 For this term, see Bates, *Hermeneutics*, 218.

30 See, for example, the evidence cited in Carl Andresen, “Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffes,” *ZNW* 52 (1961): 14–18; Michael Slusser, “The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology,” *TS* 49 (1988): 468–470.

31 Bates, *Hermeneutics*, 218.

32 Bates, *Hermeneutics*, 199–204.

33 Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr’s Proof-Text Tradition—Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*, NovTSup56 (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 157.

But whenever you hear the sayings of the prophets spoken as from a person (ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου), do not suppose that they are spoken from the inspired ones themselves, but from the divine Logos who moves them. For sometimes he speaks as one announcing beforehand the things that are about to happen, but sometimes he speaks as from the person of God, the Master and Father of all, still other times as from the person of Christ, and at still other times as from the person of the people answering the Lord or his Father. This sort of thing is also seen in your writers, when the writer of the whole is one individual but he puts forward the dialoguing persons (πρόσωπα δὲ τὰ διαλεγόμενα παραφέροντα).<sup>34</sup>

There are several items of importance to note at this point. First, as Justin himself points out, his use of prosopological exegesis (identifying the various speaking persons or πρόσωπα) would have been readily intelligible to his audience; after all, Justin argues, “this sort of thing is also seen in your writers.” Indeed, as Minns and Parvis write with respect to this passage, “Justin sees himself as engaged in a task proper to the philosopher: establishing the rules of interpretation for the texts of his school.”<sup>35</sup> It was the Jews’ failure to observe this basic principle of interpretation, Justin claims, which caused them to not recognize Christ initially and then causes them to hate Christians in Justin’s own day.<sup>36</sup>

Second, within his conception of how prosopological exegesis should be employed with respect to the Hebrew Scriptures, Justin insists that it is the divine Logos who is the one speaking from these various characters. Still, in light of Justin’s statements elsewhere<sup>37</sup> and his aforementioned binitarian tendency, we should perhaps more precisely articulate this as an action of the

34 1 *Apol.* 36.1–2 (SC 507:224): “Ὅταν δὲ τὰς λέξεις τῶν προφητῶν λεγομένας ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου ακούητε, μὴ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐμπεπνευσμένων λέγεσθαι νομίσητε, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ κινούντος αὐτοὺς θεοῦ Λόγου. Ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ὡς προαγγελτικῶς τὰ μέλλοντα γενήσεσθαι λέγει, ποτὲ δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ δεσπότου πάντων καὶ πατρὸς θεοῦ φθέγγεται, ποτὲ δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ποτὲ δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου λαῶν ἀποκρινομένων τῷ κυρίῳ ἢ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ· ὁποῖον καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν παρ’ ὑμῖν συγγραφέων ἰδεῖν ἔστιν, ἕνα μὲν τὸν τὰ πάντα συγγράφοντα ὄντα, πρόσωπα δὲ τὰ διαλεγόμενα παραφέροντα.

35 Minns and Parvis, *Justin*, 179 n. 4; cf. Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 12; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 89; Goodenough, *Theology of Justin Martyr*, 178–179; Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier Recherches et bilan, 2: Exégèse prosopologique et théologie* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1985), 24–29; Bates, *Hermeneutics*, 203; idem, *Birth*, 32–34.

36 1 *Apol.* 36.3 (SC 507:224–226).

37 See, e.g., 1 *Apol.* 38.1, 44.1, 47.1, 53.6, 61.13 (SC 507:228, 242, 252, 268, 292); *Dial.* 7.1 (PTS 47:83).

Spirit as it participates in the divine Logos.<sup>38</sup> Alternatively, as demonstrated above, the functional overlap between the Spirit and the Logos as “powers” of God could indicate that in this particular instance Justin is appealing to a notion of Spirit that has less to do with discrete personality and more to do with a generic power of divine inspiration. In any event, while in Justin’s writings the Spirit often, if not primarily, functions as the power by which the prophets and even the other divine persons speak,<sup>39</sup> this chapter will demonstrate that Justin on occasion also portrays the Spirit as speaking truly and exclusively as its own theodramatic person.<sup>40</sup> As described in the introduction of this book, I will distinguish between these two forms of the Spirit’s prosopological speech using Bates’s terminology of the Spirit as an “inspiring secondary agent” and a “primary speaking agent.”<sup>41</sup>

### *The Spirit and Prosopological Exegesis in Dial. 56*

With this in mind, we can return to *Dial.* 56.14–15 and, recognizing it as an instance of prosopological exegesis,<sup>42</sup> begin the process of seeking to understand the logic by which Justin attributed these particular Old Testament quo-

38 Thus, Goodenough (*Theology of Justin Martyr*, 179) can say that, despite this confusion of function, the Spirit is the true speaker of every quotation. Cf. Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 103. Perhaps the best explanation is given by Bates (*Hermeneutics*, 200), who points out that Justin believes the Spirit was responsible for planting “seeds of truth” (σπέρματα ἀληθείας) among even the Greco-Roman philosophers, as at *1 Apol.* 44.8–10 (SC 507:244) and *Dial.* 7.2–3 (PTS 47:83), and that these seeds were a means of participation in the Logos prior to the incarnation. See further Slusser, “Exegetical Roots,” 464 n. 14; Allert, *Revelation*, 152–153.

39 Bates, *Birth*, 33; idem, *Hermeneutics*, 200–201. See further idem, “Justin Martyr’s Logocentric Hermeneutical Transformation of Isaiah’s Vision of the Nations,” *JTS* 60 (2009): 538–555, and especially 547–549.

40 Bates, *Birth*, 164–165; cf. Briggman, “Justin’s Approach,” 121–123. This conclusion differs from the earlier view of Slusser (“Exegetical Roots,” 476), who argued, “Apart from a very few texts of Tertullian [...], the Holy Spirit does not appear as an interlocutor within the texts we have seen examined by prosopological exegesis. Instead, the Spirit is the source of all the utterances of Scripture. [...] [T]he Spirit never attains the personal definition of the others; and yet, if by *prosōpon* is meant ‘the one who speaks and concerning whom he speaks and to whom he speaks,’ the dignity, if not the clear definition, cannot be denied to the Holy Spirit.”

41 Bates, *Birth*, 164 n. 18.

42 As Slusser (“Exegetical Roots,” 466–468) notes, Justin is clearly utilizing prosopological exegesis in this section, as he is trying to determine the identities of the speaker, audience, and referent, even though the word *πρόσωπον* does not appear in this particular passage; cf. Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques*, 28–29.



tations to the πρόσωπον of the Spirit. First, though, we must consider the broader context of *Dial.* 56–62. This section is marked as a distinct unit of *Dial.* on account of its single overarching argument, namely that the Pentateuch demonstrates that there exists, besides God the Father, another God (ἕτερος θεός)—Jesus.<sup>43</sup> Specifically, in chapters 56–60, Justin argues this point on the basis of the Old Testament theophanies, which he interprets christologically.<sup>44</sup>

Justin in *Dial.* 56 is particularly interested in establishing the right interpretation of the theophany in Gen 18–19 as proof of the existence of a second God, concluding that the pre-incarnate Christ was the “Lord” and “God” who appeared to Abraham at Mamre in Gen 18 and later destroyed Sodom, and that he is to be distinguished from the God in heaven who commissioned him for these tasks (cf. *Dial.* 56.22–23).<sup>45</sup> As one of his pieces of evidence, Justin draws attention to the wording of the biblical text, noting that it reads “the Lord rained on Sodom brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven” (Gen 19:24),<sup>46</sup> which appears to distinguish between two divine persons. Justin then supports this claim by bringing in dialogical passages, such as Ps 110:1 and Ps 45:6–7, as other examples of these divine doublets. It is here, at *Dial.* 56.14–15, in which Justin’s key invocation of the Spirit is found:

“It is not only because of this [quotation],” I said, “that it is in every way necessary to admit that, besides the one considered Maker of all things, some other was called ‘Lord’ by the Holy Spirit—not only through Moses, but also through David, when he said, *The Lord says to my Lord: Sit at my*

43 Justin’s thesis is most clearly set out in *Dial.* 56.11 (PTS 47:163): “Let us return to the Scriptures and I shall try to convince you that he who is said to have appeared to Abraham, Jacob, and Moses, and is called God, is distinct from God, the Creator; distinct, that is, in number, but not in mind” (trans. Falls).

44 The theme of the Old Testament theophanies is also discussed in detail in *Dial.* 125–129 (PTS 47:285–294); other references in Justin’s writings include *Dial.* 37–38, 75, 86, 113–114 (PTS 47:131–134, 200, 219–220, 263–267); 1 *Apol.* 62–63 (SC 507:292–300). For extensive analysis of this section of *Dial.*, see Benedict Kominiak, *The Theophanies of the Old Testament in the Writings of St. Justin*, Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology 2/14 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1948), 23–47; Demetrius C. Trakatellis, *The Pre-Existence of Christ in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, HDR 6 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976), 53–92. In *Dial.* 61–62 (PTS 47:174–178), which we will not treat here, Justin’s argument shifts to Christ’s role in creation; cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 207–208.

45 Cf. Kominiak, *Theophanies*, 33–40; Trakatellis, *Pre-Existence*, 64–65; Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 410–412; Slusser, “Exegetical Roots,” 466–467.

46 *Dial.* 56.12 (PTS 47:164): καὶ ὁ κύριος ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σόδομα θεῖον καὶ πῦρ παρὰ κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

*right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool* [Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1)], as I have quoted before. And again in other words, *Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; the scepter of your kingdom is a scepter of uprightness. You have loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows* [Ps 45:6–7 (LXX 44:7–8)]. Tell me, then, if you think that the Holy Spirit calls another ‘God’ and ‘Lord’ besides the Father of all things and his Christ.”<sup>47</sup>

Starting with the manner in which Justin frames the quotations from the Psalter in this passage, it may first be observed how both before the quotations (κυριολογείται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος) and after them (θεολογεῖν καὶ κυριολογεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν), Justin presents the Spirit as the true speaker who is calling the Son “Lord” and “God.” The clear implication of this text is that while David indeed “said” (εἶρηται) this quotation in the text’s prophetic setting, the Holy Spirit stands behind David as the one testifying to the Son as it “calls” the Son “Lord” (κυριολογεῖται) in the text’s theodramatic setting. There is likely some significance in the past-tense action ascribed to David (εἶρηται), as opposed to the present-tense, presumably gnomic, action of the Spirit (κυριολογεῖται). The Spirit, then, is not merely an agent of inspiration, but the true, omnitemporal speaker of the words that David simply transcribes.<sup>48</sup>

Next, we need to consider in more detail the lexical features of the key verbs in this passage, namely θεολογέω and κυριολογέω. Neither of these verbs appear in the Septuagint, the New Testament, or the Apostolic Fathers; in fact, Justin appears to be one of the first Christian writers to use these terms. Regarding the first of these words, θεολογέω, Lampe suggests five domains of meaning, with the most common being “to speculate or teach about God”; it is from this usage that the cognate noun θεολογία is undoubtedly derived.<sup>49</sup> Justin’s usage of the word at *Dial.* 56.15, however, clearly falls under the fifth definition, to “acknowledge as divine.”<sup>50</sup> As Lampe’s lengthy entry on this word indicates, θεολογέω

47 *Dial.* 56.14–15 (PTS 47:164–165).

48 Bates (*Birth*, 164 n. 18) admits uncertainty concerning whether the Spirit is the primary or the secondary agent in the particular case of *Dial.* 56.14–15 (PTS 47:164–165), but nevertheless posits that the Spirit is “probably” speaking in this passage as its own theodramatic person (*Birth*, 164), as I have suggested here (contra Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 19).

49 Lampe, s.v. θεολογέω A. This also appears to be the primary non-Christian usage of the word; cf. LSJ, s.v. θεολογέω.

50 Lampe, s.v. θεολογέω E. Besides *Dial.* 56.15 (PTS 47:164), Justin uses this verb one other time, at *Dial.* 113.2 (PTS 47:263), but with the more common meaning of “to speculate or teach about God.”

went on to have a long track record of usage throughout the patristic period, especially during the fourth-century Trinitarian and christological controversies.

The verb *κυριολογέω*, however, is less commonly used in early Christian writings; Justin is the only apologist to use it, and he does so only twice, at *Dial.* 56.14 and 56.15.<sup>51</sup> Though its primary meaning is along the lines of to “use words in their proper or literal sense” or to “express clearly or accurately,”<sup>52</sup> it can also mean, as it does here, to “call Lord” or “describe as Lord.”<sup>53</sup> The best meaning in the context of our particular passage is probably parallel to how *θεολογέω* is here understood: “to acknowledge as Lord.” Thus, in sum, these verbs indicate that the Spirit in these quotations is calling or acknowledging Christ as Lord and God; in other words, we should think of the Spirit not as actively endowing these titles onto Christ, but rather recognizing and proclaiming Christ as such.<sup>54</sup> Though Justin does not use the exact Greek equivalent of this word, we may nevertheless follow Briggman in reasonably judging the English word “testify” as most adequately holding together this field of meaning. I will, therefore, use it in the rest of the chapter to summarize the ideas described above. The significance of Justin’s innovation with respect to these terms, especially in light of later patristic usage, should not be lost on us; we will in fact revisit this topic in the final section of this chapter.

Finally, we turn to the quotations themselves in *Dial.* 56.14. First, Justin points backwards to his citation of Gen 19:24 as evidence from Moses that the Holy Spirit calls another “Lord” besides the Father.<sup>55</sup> Justin views this text as evidence of the Spirit speaking through Scripture to identify the Son as a second Lord besides the Father and uses it as a transition to then bring in two dialogical texts from the Psalter to make the same point. However, relative to the quotations that will follow, the fact that Gen 19:24 is simply a third-person narrative description and not a first-person dialogical text comparatively diminishes

51 Cf. Edgar J. Goodspeed, *Index Apologeticus* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912), s.v. *κυριολογεῖν*.

52 Lampe, s.v. *κυριολογέω* 1–2. This is also the usage given in LSJ, s.v. *κυριολεκτέω*.

53 Lampe, s.v. *κυριολογέω* 3.

54 This testimony to Christ as both Lord and God may be an echo of Thomas’s confession in John 20:28.

55 On Gen 19:24, Trakatellis (*Pre-Existence*, 65) argues that “it should be classified among [Justin’s] basic christological passages,” noting that it occurs six times in *Dial.* Skarsaune (*Proof from Prophecy*, 209 n. 62) points out that Justin understands the text to be speaking of a second Lord’s location in heaven whereas the LXX text seems clear enough that it is the fire and brimstone that are located in heaven. As such, Skarsaune suspects a non-LXX testimony version of Gen 19:24 may have influenced Justin’s exegesis.

the distinct personality of the Spirit by presenting it as a secondary inspiring agent and not as a primary speaking agent. This would seem to exclude this passage from consideration as an instance of prosopological exegesis according to Bates's definition, but to the extent that the Spirit is still identified as the true or ultimate speaker of a text in which it is not otherwise in view we could plausibly construe this as a diminished form of prosopological exegesis in which the personality of the Spirit is greatly diminished. If anything, the inclusion of Gen 19:24 as the words of the Spirit alongside Ps 110:1 and Ps 45:6–7 should caution us against pressing modern categorizations and definitions too firmly on a writer such as Justin, a point which will be explored in more detail below.

Second, Justin quotes and prosopologically interprets Ps 110:1: "The Lord says to my Lord: Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool." Ps 110 is quoted frequently in Justin's writings,<sup>56</sup> though Justin apparently quotes from two different text-types, one that follows the LXX and one that does not.<sup>57</sup> Here Justin quotes only the first verse of the psalm, and the text deviates from the LXX in the case of the first verb, which in the LXX reads the past-tense εἶπεν instead of the present-tense λέγει. This likely indicates that Justin is taking this quotation from the non-LXX text of Ps 110 used in *Dial.* 83.2, which also begins with λέγει and is almost certainly drawn from a testimony source.<sup>58</sup> This change likely serves to underscore the present and continuing nature of Christ's reign. In any case, this verse had, from pre-Pauline times, been interpreted prosopologically as the words of the Father to the Son, and thus served as a *testimonium* to the exaltation of Christ.<sup>59</sup> Without doubt, it was the christological signifi-

56 See, e.g., 1 *Apol.* 45.2–4 (SC 507:248); *Dial.* 32.6, 56.14, 63.3, 83.1–4, 127.5 (PTS 47:123, 164, 179, 213–214, 291). The usage in *Dial.* 32.6 is in effect parallel to that in *Dial.* 56.14; in *Dial.* 32.6, Justin cites Ps 110, in which, as he had argued in *Dial.* 32.3 (PTS 47:122), "Christ is also called 'Lord' by the holy prophetic Spirit" (κύριον τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου προφητικοῦ πνεύματος λεγόμενον). Cf. *Dial.* 33.2, 124.4 (PTS 47:124, 285).

57 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 86–88.

58 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 86, 231. This matter is further complicated in light of the fact that an increasing number of Septuagintal scholars are of the opinion that there was no single standard edition of the LXX. Thus, it is also possible that these deviations may in fact reflect a different LXX *Vorlage* that is no longer extant.

59 Cf. Martin C. Albl, "And Scripture Cannot Be Broken": *The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 46 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 216–236. The literature on the Christian use of Ps 110:1 is vast, and the various functions to which this text was put to use exceed the scope of this book. The most thorough study of the topic is David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*, SBLMS 18 (Nashville: Abing-

cance of this verse that captured the attention of early Christian interpreters. What appears to be less important at this early stage, as demonstrated by the variety of interpretations given, was the identity of the speaker of the quotation, that is, the one reporting the words of the Father to the Son.<sup>60</sup> Justin, however, for reasons he does not make explicit, here identifies the speaker as the Spirit, who is through this text calling Jesus “Lord” (κυριολογεῖται); there is thus a divine person reporting the words of another divine person concerning still another divine person, making this a clear case of the subset of prosopological exegesis that I have termed intra-divine dialogue.<sup>61</sup> Though Justin’s commentary on the text seems to restrict the Spirit’s testimony to acknowledging the Son’s lordship, it should not be lost on us that this verse also calls the Father “Lord,” a point that would be particularly resonant in the debate with Marcion.

The third text Justin quotes and places in the mouth of the Spirit is Ps 45:6–7: “Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; the scepter of your kingdom is a scepter of uprightness. You have loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows.” Justin’s text of these verses follows the LXX both here and when he cites Ps 45 at greater length elsewhere.<sup>62</sup> Interestingly, Ps 45:6–7 is found alongside Ps 110:1 in the catena of Old Testament quotations in Heb 1:5–13, which most scholars recognize derived from a previous *testimonia* collection.<sup>63</sup> This suggests that, like Ps 110:1, this verse was interpreted christologically from a very

---

don, 1973). For our purposes, we are only concerned with the identity of the *speaker* of Ps 110:1a, an issue that is largely ignored in the literature. We will return to the issue of *testimonia* below.

- 60 Early options included “David himself, by (ἐν) the Holy Spirit,” as at Mark 12:36; merely “David himself,” as at Luke 20:42; Acts 2:34; *Barn.* 12.10 (LCL 25:60); “the Good,” an interpretation that, according to Hippolytus at *Haer.* 5.26.16–18 (PTS 25:204), is found in the Gnostic *Book of Baruch* (cf. Hay, *Glory*, 48); others simply deleted the phrase “the Lord said to my Lord” and resolved the question that way, as at *1 Clem.* 36.4 (LCL 24:100). See also Bates, *Birth*, 44–56, 59–62, 160–163.
- 61 As noted in the introduction to this book, I am using the term *intra-divine dialogue* to refer to that subset of prosopological exegesis in which the divine persons are speaking to or about other divine persons.
- 62 *Dial.* 63.4 (PTS 47:179); cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 126. Heb 1:8–9 (NA28:658) reads the following for the text of Ps 45:6–7, showing slight differences from Justin’s form of the text: ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς εὐθύτητος ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου. ἡγάπησας δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέν σε ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου.
- 63 Cf. Albl, *Scripture*, 201–207.

early point in the Christian movement.<sup>64</sup> Again, however, Justin appears to do something novel with this verse by drawing the Spirit into the discussion as a further instance of intra-divine dialogue.

An analysis of the differences and similarities among these biblical quotations is revealing. On the one hand, the specific manner in which the Spirit testifies can vary. Whereas in the case of Gen 19:24 the Spirit simply describes the Father and the Son in the third person, and in the case of Ps 110:1 the Spirit reports the words of the Father to the Son, in the case of Ps 45:6–7 the Spirit is speaking to the Son concerning the actions of the Father. Despite these differences, there is an essential continuity: in each instance the Spirit is speaking prosopologically through Old Testament passages that make reference to both the Father and the Son, an action of the Spirit which Justin summarizes with the words θεολογέω and κυριολογέω and that we might subsume under the label of intra-divine dialogue.

It is at this point that we can return to our discussion of the *topos* of divine testimony. As noted in the introduction of this book, the ancient *topos* of divine testimony was a rhetorical device employed in Hellenistic narratives to signal, through both word and deed, divine approval or disapproval of a particular character or characters.<sup>65</sup> In the Gospels, the most obvious instance of the Spirit providing divine testimony is in the scene at Jesus's baptism, where the Spirit descends on Jesus like a dove (Mark 1:10 pars.). An ancient audience would have most likely understood this to be an instance of divine testimony through the actions of a bird of divine origins; the accompanying words of the heavenly voice further make it clear that this scene is providing testimony from God concerning Jesus.<sup>66</sup> The key difference between this scene and our passage in Justin is that only in the latter case is the Spirit the divine person who provides the testimony; in the former, the Spirit is merely the symbolic means by which the Father provides his own testimony. Perhaps, therefore, a better comparison with the New Testament is found in James McConnell's claim that quotations of Scripture could function, like oracles, as instances of divine testimony through utterances.<sup>67</sup> In one sense, then, Justin's description of the Spirit speaking through Scripture follows within a well-established tradi-

64 "The 'two Gods' testimonies are the traditional basis from which Justin works" (Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 209). Cf. Trakatellis, *Pre-Existence*, 65–66.

65 See again James R. McConnell Jr., *The topos of Divine Testimony in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014).

66 McConnell, *Divine Testimony*, 232–235.

67 McConnell, *Divine Testimony*, 140–174. Justin himself interprets Jesus's baptism in these terms at *Dial.* 88.8 (PTS 47:224).

tion by which divine testimony is given through the words of Scripture. The key difference, I propose, concerns the *subject* of the divine testimony. In all of the examples McConnell cites, divine testimony concerning Jesus focuses, per the normal function of the *topos*, on demonstrating God's approval of Jesus (see again the words spoken at Jesus's baptism). Justin, however, has gone beyond using divine testimony to signal approval to using divine testimony to call other beings "Lord" and "God."

This extension of the *topos* of divine testimony is thus a further way in which Justin's approach to the testimony of the Spirit should be considered a significant innovation. To distinguish this usage from how the *topos* normally functions, I will throughout this book refer to the action of one divine being testifying to the lordship or divinity of another being as *intra-divine testimony*. There are times, however, as in the case of *Dial.* 56.14–15, when this intra-divine testimony is used to ascribe qualities to both of the other divine persons; we will more narrowly identify this type of intra-divine testimony as *Trinitarian testimony*. As noted in the introduction of this book, though the use of the term "Trinitarian" is admittedly to a large extent anachronistic when applied to Justin's theology, the way in which Justin draws the Spirit, as its own person, into theodramatic dialogues in which the other two divine persons are already in view anticipates the development of later Trinitarian theology, as we will see later in this study.

To further explore this Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, we can further distinguish between two modes in which the Spirit testifies to the divinity and lordship of the other divine persons, corresponding to the two different senses in which the Spirit speaks prosopologically through Scripture. On the one hand, the Spirit can testify simply through its general inspiration of all the words of Scripture in its capacity as an inspiring secondary agent, as seen above in the case of Gen 19:24. The personhood of the Spirit is comparatively diminished in this likewise diminished form of prosopological exegesis, as the Spirit is presented more as an inspiring force than as a distinct person participating in the divine theodrama. On the other hand, the Spirit can also testify as a reporter or a participant in what is read prosopologically (in the full sense of the term) as intra-divine dialogue in its capacity as a primary speaking agent, as seen above in the cases of Ps 110:1 and Ps 45:6–7. In this form of testimony, the personality of the Spirit is heightened through its portrayal as a distinct actor in the divine theodrama. Therefore, over the course of the rest of this book, we will use the technical term *Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit* to encompass both of these actions in which the Spirit provides testimony through its prosopological speech—generally as a primary speaking agent, but also on rare occasion as an inspiring secondary agent—to the deity or lordship of the Father and the Son.

Thus, having analyzed the data in more detail, we can confirm Briggman's passing observation that Justin gives the Spirit a special role "in testifying to the deity and sovereignty of the Father and the Son."<sup>68</sup> Nevertheless, we still have not proven, as Briggman merely suggested was the case, that this role was unique or distinctive to the Spirit. This leads, then, to a consideration of whether or not Justin restricted this testifying role to the Spirit and how it relates to the Spirit's other speaking activities. Answering these questions will require us to undertake a broader study of Justin's use of prosopological exegesis, to which we now turn.

### Differentiating Justin's Use of Prosopological Exegesis

We have seen that Justin in *Dial.* 56.14–15 assigns to the Spirit a designated speaking role insofar as the Spirit speaks through Scripture for the purpose of providing Trinitarian testimony. We can, however, only validate the distinctiveness of the Spirit's role in providing any form of intra-divine testimony by comparing how Justin uses prosopological exegesis elsewhere in his writings; in particular, we are concerned with the kinds of Old Testament quotations that Justin attributes to the other divine persons as well as to the Spirit. Conveniently, following on the heels of his general discussion of prosopological exegesis in *1 Apol.* 36, Justin helps us by giving examples of the types of quotations he assigns to each divine person in *1 Apol.* 37–45. Justin gives examples of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Father (*1 Apol.* 37), then from the person of the Son (*1 Apol.* 38), and finally from the prophetic Spirit (*1 Apol.* 39–45). We will consider each of these units in turn, analyzing the nature of the quotations Justin provides and then comparing our conclusions with other examples of prosopological exegesis from elsewhere in Justin's writings.

#### *Prosopological Exegesis from the Father*

Justin first provides examples of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Father:

And that this too may become clear to you, these words were spoken [as] from the person of the Father (ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς) through Isa-

68 Briggman, "Justin's Approach," 113. Citing *Dial.* 56.15 (PTS 47:164), Briggman goes on to add that, for Justin, "the Holy Spirit holds a unique position of importance, since his activity stands behind the texts of scripture that Justin uses to illustrate the divinity of the Father and his Word" ("Justin's Approach," 114). This very closely parallels my own findings above.



iah the aforementioned prophet: *The ox knows its owner, and the ass its master's manger, but Israel does not know me and my people has not understood. Woe, sinful nation, a people full of sins, an evil seed, lawless sons; you have forsaken the Lord* [Isa 1:3–4]. And again elsewhere, when the same prophet says likewise [as] from [the person of] the Father, *What sort of house will you build for me? says the Lord. The heaven is my throne, and the earth is the footstool of my feet* [Isa 66:1]. And again elsewhere, *Your new moons and sabbaths my soul hates, and I am not content with the great day of the fast and of idleness; nor, if you should come to be seen by me, will I hear you. Your hands are full of blood. And if you offer the finest wheaten flour and incense, it is an abomination to me. The fat of lambs and the blood of bulls I do not desire. For who demanded these things from your hands? But break every bond of injustice, tear asunder the knots of violent dealings, cover the homeless and naked, distribute your bread to the hungry* [Isa 1:11–15, 58:6–7]. Thus you can now perceive what sort of things are taught through the prophets [as] from [the person of] God.<sup>69</sup>

Justin frames these quotations from the book of Isaiah with statements about how he reads them prosopologically as the words of the Father. As Justin explains, the prophets are not themselves the ultimate speakers of these prophecies; rather these words are spoken “through” (διὰ) them. Neither, however, is the character of the Father the ultimate speaker; as we saw above, it is the Spirit who, in cooperation with the Logos, is the inspiring force behind all the words of Scripture, and who, in this case, moves the prophets to speak as “from the person of the Father” (ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς).

69 1 Apol. 37.1–9 (SC 507:226): “Ἰνα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν φανερόν γένηται, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς ἐλέχθησαν διὰ Ἡσαΐου, τοῦ προειρημένου προφήτου οἶδε οἱ λόγοι· Ἐγὼ βούς τὸν κτησάμενον, καὶ ὄνος τὴν φάτνην τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ. Ἰσραὴλ δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω, καὶ ὁ λαὸς με οὐ συνήκεν. Οὐαὶ ἔθνος ἁμαρτωλόν, λαὸς πλήρης ἁμαρτιῶν, σπέρμα πονηρόν, υἱοὶ ἄνομοι· ἐγκατελίπατε τὸν κύριον. Καὶ πάλιν ἄλλαχού ὅταν λέγῃ ὁ αὐτὸς προφήτης ὁμοίως ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς· Ποῖόν μοι οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετε; λέγει κύριος. Ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος, καὶ ἡ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου. Καὶ πάλιν ἄλλαχού· Τὰς νομηνίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ σάββατα μισεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου, καὶ μεγάλην ἡμέραν νηστείας καὶ ἀργίας οὐκ ἀνέχομαι· οὐδ’, ἂν ἔρρησθε ὀφθῆναι μοι, εἰσακούσομαι ὑμῶν. Πλήρεις αἱματος αἱ χεῖρες ὑμῶν. Κἂν φέρητε σμιδαλιν, θυμίαμα, βδέλυγμά μοι ἐστὶ· στέαρ ἀρνῶν καὶ αἷμα ταύρων οὐ βούλομαι. Τίς γὰρ ἐξεζήτησε ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν; Ἀλλὰ διάλυε πάντα σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας, διάσπα στραγγαλιάς βιαιῶν συναλλαγμάτων, ἄστεγον καὶ γυμνὸν σκέπε, διάθρυπτε πεινῶντι τὸν ἄρτον σου. Ὅποια μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ διδασκόμενα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, νοεῖν δύνασθε. Throughout this passage, I understand the full phrase ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου (cf. 1 Apol. 36.1) to be understood whether or not the text should actually be emended (as various other editions have done) to make this explicit.

Turning to the quotations themselves, Justin has selected three examples, all from the book of Isaiah, portraying the kinds of statements that are said “from the person of the Father” or “from the person of God.” These scriptural quotations all share a common theme: namely, that Israel, in light of its mistaken emphasis on cultic worship, has failed to truly know God, an idea that serves Justin’s larger argument of defending Christianity’s rejection of the Mosaic Law.<sup>70</sup> What is strange about these quotations, though, is that, at least by modern definitions, it would seem at first glance that we cannot truly speak of prosopological exegesis from “the person of God” when the Old Testament source texts explicitly describe God as the subject of the speech. Perhaps one way to make sense of Justin here is to keep in mind that early Christian binitarian (and later Trinitarian) beliefs extended the notion of “God” such that when “God” speaks in the Old Testament, one could legitimately differentiate “God the Father” from “God the Son” and so forth. In particular, in these verses, “the Father” is clearly not in view in the source texts, as this understanding of God reflects a Christian innovation. The reference to “God” at the end of *1 Apol.* 37.9 also shows that Justin treats the terms “the Father” and “God” as parallel, clearly intending these particular verses to be interpreted prosopologically, at least in this immediate context.

This complicates our efforts to analyze prosopological exegesis from the first person of the Trinity insofar as Justin appears to leave open the possibility that every reference to “God” could be read as “God the Father” and therefore prosopologically. Still, in the dozens of other instances in which Justin introduces an Old Testament quotation as the words of “God,” Justin gives no indication that he is reading to discern a particular divine person as the speaker, and is probably simply quoting without concern for this issue. In any event, the vast majority of such quotations follow the pattern of God condemning Israel’s sin (and, by extension, his promise of a new covenant that will incorporate the Gentiles into the people of God) and do not have anything to do with other divine persons; therefore, they may simply be set aside as not having any bearing on our argument.<sup>71</sup> Instead, in our analysis below, we will focus only on

70 This is, of course, a major theme in Justin’s writings. See further Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 156–161; Theodore Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, SBLDS 20 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972), *passim*; Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 295–326; Allert, *Revelation*, 169–171, 223–231; Rokéah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews*, 47–60. This collection of quotations likely reflects “a Judaeo-Christian substratum which has passed through Gentile Christian hands before it reached Justin” and a setting in the mission to the God-fearers among the Gentiles (Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 326).

71 See, e.g., *Dial.* 16.1, 18.2, 19.2, 19.6, 20.4, 21.1–3, 27.4, 28.3–6, 32.5, 41.2, 44.2, 82.3–4, 107.3–4,

those instances in which the words of “God” or “the Father” are spoken either concerning or to another divine person, as it is in these cases that we would possibly find examples of intra-divine or even Trinitarian testimony.<sup>72</sup> The results of this study are summarized in Table 1 on the following page.<sup>73</sup>

There are, therefore, a large number of instances in which Justin reads the Old Testament as the words of God (presumably God the Father; cf. *1 Apol.* 37) concerning another divine person or to another divine person. In every example, the other divine person is the Son; the Spirit is never in view in the Father’s prosopological speech.<sup>74</sup> The passages in which the Father speaks concerning the Son seem to cluster around the basic theme of describing the Son’s ministry over the course of his incarnation. Most of these have to do with the Son’s mission to the Gentiles (Gen 49:10; Deut 33:13–17; Ps 72:17; Isa 42:1–4, 51:4–5, 62:10–63:6), which reflects Justin’s overall concern to present the Gentile church as the new Israel, though other examples describe the Son’s nativity (Ps 110:3), priestly function (Ps 110:4), and death and burial (Isa 57:1–4). In every instance

---

117.1, 119.4, 120.1, 123.3–6, 133.2–3 (PTS 47:96, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 114, 115, 123, 138, 142, 212–213, 254, 271, 275, 276, 282–283, 299–300). Apart from *1 Apol.* 37 (described above) and *Dial.* 121.4 (included in Table 1), the only other place in which the Father is explicitly identified as the speaker of an Old Testament text is with respect to Isa 1:16–20 at *1 Apol.* 44.2–4 (SC 507:242). This passage, still part of this unit on prosopological exegesis (*1 Apol.* 37–45), simply sets out the “two ways” offered to Israel and does not involve any other divine persons; it thus fits with the pattern established in *1 Apol.* 37. Likewise, we will not consider quotations that are probably meant to be read as words of the Father to or about the Son but are not marked as such (i.e., they are presented just as the words of “Scripture” or of the prophet and it is only the content of the quotation itself that suggests such a reading); cf., e.g., *Dial.* 12.1, 13.2–9, 14.4–7, 32.6, 83.2, 118.2, 122.3, 135.2 (PTS 47:89, 90–92, 93–94, 129, 213–214, 273, 280, 303–304); *1 Apol.* 45.2–4, 50.3–4 (SC 507:248, 258). Similarly, with respect to the Spirit, see *Dial.* 87.6 (PTS 47:222).

72 This also has the benefit of identifying readings that are much more likely true examples of prosopological exegesis; even if “God” is the speaker, so long as the words of God’s speech are spoken concerning or to the Son, we can plausibly assume that Justin means to identify the Father as the true speaker of the text. Some may still see this as a stretch of what constitutes prosopological exegesis, but I am including these liminal cases in order to make sure that all possibly relevant data has been accounted for.

73 As will be true of subsequent tables in this book, this table of necessity over-simplifies data that is much less orderly in reality (especially with respect to verse numbers and categorizations). Nevertheless, I think that these tables suffice to make my point in general terms, regardless of how any individual item might be otherwise interpreted.

74 To put this another way, whereas the quotations attributed to the Spirit in *Dial.* 56.14–15 (PTS 47:164–165) speak of both the Father *and* the Son, here the Father speaks only of or to the Son.

TABLE 1 *Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to God/the Father in the writings of Justin*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Dial.</i> 11.3 (PTS 47:88)	Isa 51:4–5; Jer 31:31–32	God	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Dial.</i> 16.5 (PTS 47:97)	Isa 57:1–4	God	describes the ministry of the Son (death/burial)
<i>Dial.</i> 19.4 (PTS 47:101)	Ps 110:4 (LXX 109:4)	God	describes the ministry of the Son (priestly role)
<i>Dial.</i> 26.2 (PTS 47:112)	Isa 42:6–7	God	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Dial.</i> 26.3–4 (PTS 47:112)	Isa 62:10–63:6	God	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Dial.</i> 33.2 (PTS 47:124)	Ps 110:4 (LXX 109:4)	God	describes the ministry of the Son (priestly role)
<i>Dial.</i> 62.1 (PTS 47:176)	Gen 1:26–28	God	gives instructions to the Son (creation)
<i>Dial.</i> 63.3 (PTS 47:179)	Ps 110:3–4 (LXX 109:3–4)	God	describes the nativity of the Son
<i>Dial.</i> 65.4–7 (PTS 47:182–183)	Isa 42:5–13	God	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Dial.</i> 91.1 (PTS 47:226)	Deut 33:13–17	God	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Dial.</i> 120.3 (PTS 47:277)	Gen 49:10	God (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 119.6)	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Dial.</i> 121.1 (PTS 47:278)	Ps 72:17 (LXX 71:17)	God	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Dial.</i> 121.4 (PTS 47:280)	Isa 49:6	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Dial.</i> 122.5 (PTS 47:281)	Isa 49:8	God	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Dial.</i> 122.6 (PTS 47:281)	Ps 2:7–8	God (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 122.5)	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Dial.</i> 123.8 (PTS 47:283)	Isa 42:1–4	God	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)

when the Father speaks to the Son, it is to commission his ministry to the Gentiles (Ps 2:7–8; Isa 42:5–13, 49:6, 49:8), with the sole exception of the command to create in Gen 1:26. In none of these examples is there any reference to testimony to the deity and lordship of other divine persons; the words θεολογέω and κυριολογέω are nowhere linked to the Father's speech in Justin's writings. The closest Justin comes to this is in his presentation of Ps 2:7 as the words of the Father, but this is, as the introduction of this book noted, a textbook example of the *topos* of divine testimony and not testimony to the lordship or divinity of the Son; in any event, Justin does not pay any attention to this aspect of the psalm, instead focusing on how Ps 2:8 prefigures the mission to the Gentiles. There is, therefore, no intra-divine testimony assigned to the Father in Justin's writings. It will be instructive to compare these conclusions with those we draw from Justin's discussion of prosopological exegesis from the Son and from the Spirit, topics to which we now turn.

### *Prosopological Exegesis from the Son*

Having completed his sampling of scriptural quotations attributed to the Father (1 *Apol.* 37), Justin in 1 *Apol.* 38 turns to examples of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Son:

And when the prophetic Spirit speaks [as] from the person of Christ (ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ), it speaks in this way: *I spread out my hands over a disobedient and disputatious people, over those who walk in a way that is not good* [Isa 65:2]. And again, *I have given my back to scourges and my cheeks to slaps; I did not turn my face away from the shame of spittings. And the Lord became my helper; therefore I was not put to shame, but I set my face as a solid rock and knew that I would not be ashamed, for the one who justifies me is near* [Isa 50:6–8]. And again when it says, *They cast lots for my clothing* [Ps 22:18b (LXX 21:19b)], and *pierced my feet and hands* [Ps 22:16c (LXX 21:17c)]. But *I lay down and slept, and rose again, because the Lord helped me* [Ps 3:5 (LXX 3:6)]. \*\*\* And again when it says, *They spoke with their lips, they shook the head, saying, Let him deliver himself* [cf. Ps 22:7–8 (LXX 21:8–9)]. That all these things happened to Christ by the Jews, you are able to learn. For when he was crucified they shot out their lips and shook their heads, saying, *Let him who raised the dead save himself* [cf. Matt 27:39–43].<sup>75</sup>

75 1 *Apol.* 38.1–8 (SC 507:228): "Ὅταν δὲ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγῃ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, οὕτως φθέγγεται· Ἐγὼ ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ἐπὶ λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα, ἐπὶ τοὺς

We may notice from the beginning of this passage that it is again the Spirit, here identified more precisely as “the prophetic Spirit” (τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα), who is the ultimate source of the speech “from the person of Christ” (ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Χριστοῦ). Turning to the first five quotations that Justin provides as examples of prosopological speech from the Son, all taken from Isaiah and the Psalter, we can observe that each of them feature what early Christians believed to be prophecies of the life and passion of Christ.<sup>76</sup> The first-person recounting of these events no doubt contributed to the ease with which early Christians read such texts as from the person of Christ. The reference to Ps 22:7–8, however, appears to break this pattern, as there is no way to plausibly understand this quotation as spoken from the person of Christ. As such, it is almost certain that our text is corrupt and that something has fallen out that would otherwise help us to make sense of this quotation.<sup>77</sup> With respect to other divine persons, only two of these examples have any bearing on another divine person; both Isa 50:7 and Ps 3:5 are instances of the Son describing how the Father raised him from the dead, though neither verse involves any sort of testimony.

While Justin elsewhere reads additional passages from the Old Testament as the words of the Son concerning his rejection by Israel and resulting passion, because these do not involve other divine persons, we can set them aside as irrelevant for our study.<sup>78</sup> Instead, we will focus on just those places in which

---

πορευομένους ἐν ὁδῷ οὐ καλῇ. Καὶ πάλιν· Τὸν νῶτόν μου τέθεικα εἰς μάστιγας καὶ τὰς σιαγόνας μου εἰς ῥαπίσματα, τὸ δὲ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ἀπέστρεψα ἀπὸ αἰσχύνῃς ἐμπτυσμάτων. Καὶ ὁ κύριος βοηθός μου ἐγένετο· διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐνετράπην, ἀλλ’ ἔβηκα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὡς στερεὰν πέτραν, καὶ ἔγνων ὅτι οὐ μὴ αἰσχυνηθῶ, ὅτι ἐγγίξει ὁ δικαίωσάς με. Καὶ πάλιν ὅταν λέγῃ· Αὐτοὶ ἔβαλον κλῆρον ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου, καὶ ὠρυζάν μου πόδας καὶ χεῖρας. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ὕπνωσα, καὶ ἀνέστην, ὅτι κύριος ἀντελάβετό μου. \*\*\* Καὶ πάλιν ὅταν λέγῃ· Ἐλάλησαν ἐν χεῖλεσιν, ἐκίνησαν κεφαλὴν λέγοντες· Ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν. Ἄτινα πάντα ὅτι γέγονεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῷ Χριστῷ, μαθεῖν δύνασθε. Σταυρωθέντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐξέστρεφον τὰ χεῖλη καὶ ἐκίνουν τὰς κεφαλὰς λέγοντες· Ὁ νεκρὸς ἀνεγείρας Ῥυσάσθω ἑαυτόν. The \*\*\* represents a suspected lacuna in the text.

76 On the text of the catena of Psalms quotations, see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 80–82.

77 Minns and Parvis, *Justin*, 181 n. 9: “Either this section is not in its proper place, or if it is in its proper place, some words have fallen out. If the section offers another example of the prophetic Spirit speaking out of the character of Christ it is possible that Ps. 21:8a [LXX], ‘All those seeing me mocked me’, has fallen out. If the section offers an example of the Spirit speaking out of the character of peoples answering the Lord or his Father, an introductory explanation has dropped out. When the Spirit is represented as speaking out of the character of the peoples in 1A 47.1 the words are not addressed to the Lord or to his Father.”

78 Cf., e.g., *Dial.* 24.3, 122.1, 136.2 (PTS 47:110, 280, 306); *1 Apol.* 38.1, 38.4, 49.1–4 (SC 507:228, 228, 256). To this category we may also add those passages in which Christ speaks in the Old

TABLE 2 *Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to Christ/the Lord/the Word in the writings of Justin*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Dial.</i> 61.3–5 (PTS 47:175)	Prov 8:21–36	the Word of Wisdom	describes his generation and presence with the Father at creation
<i>Dial.</i> 98.2–5 (PTS 47:238)	Ps 22:1–23 (LXX 21:2–24)	Christ (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 99.1)	tells the Father about his passion
<i>Dial.</i> 129.3 (PTS 47:294)	Prov 8:21–25	the Word (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 129.2)	describes his generation from the Father
1 <i>Apol.</i> 38.2–5 (SC 507:228)	Isa 50:6–8; Ps 3:5 (LXX 3:6)	Christ (through “the prophetic Spirit”)	describes the Father’s vindication

Justin reads the words of the Old Testament as the Son speaking to or concerning another divine person. The results of this study are summarized above in Table 2.

As this chart indicates, the only case in which the Son addresses another divine person is when the Son speaks to the Father the words of Ps 22:1–23, quoted and interpreted at length by Justin in *Dial.* 98. Paralleling the quotations attributed to the person of the Father, when the Son speaks concerning another divine person, his words only make reference to one other divine person: the

---

Testament to prefigure baptism; cf. *Dial.* 88.8 (PTS 47:224); 1 *Apol.* 62.3 (SC 507:294). Justin also at times attributes Old Testament speech to “the Word”; despite the polyvalency of the term λόγος, it is possible that some, though almost certainly not all, of these quotations are also to be understood as “from the person of Christ.” In any event, almost all of these quotations do not involve any of the other divine persons; cf. *Dial.* 49.2, 52.4, 57.2, 58.4–8 (PTS 47:150, 156, 168, 169–170). *Dial.* 86.3 (PTS 47:219) is a strange text insofar as it presents the Word (presumably, Christ) as the speaker of Ps 45:7 (LXX 44:8), a passage which in *Dial.* 56.14 (PTS 47:164) is attributed to the Spirit. This likely gets back to the issue of Justin on occasion holding that it is the Logos who is the inspiring force behind Scripture. In any event, the context of *Dial.* 86.3 is quite different; whereas in *Dial.* 56.14 the Spirit testifies to the divinity of the Father and the Son through Ps 45:7, here the Word speaks Ps 45:7 as a symbolic prefigurement of Christ. This goes to show that prosopological exegesis allows for different characters to speak the same text on different occasions, with the context of the speech as determinative. A similar issue presents with Gen 19:24 at *Dial.* 129.1 (PTS 47:293).

Father, with emphasis on the Son's generation from the Father (Prov 8:21–36) and the Father's vindication of the Son (Isa 50:6–8; Ps 3:5).<sup>79</sup> Moreover, as with the Father, the Son does not testify to any other divine person; the verbs θεολογέω and κυριολογέω are nowhere associated with the Son. Therefore, we can conclude that the notion of intra-divine (and thus Trinitarian) testimony is distinctive to the Spirit. Before we can move away from this topic, however, we must address the way in which this particular role of the Spirit fits within Justin's larger patterns of how the Spirit speaks prosopologically through the Old Testament.

### *Prosopological Exegesis from the Spirit*

Returning one last time to 1 *Apol.* 37–45, Justin in 1 *Apol.* 39 begins to provide examples of the kinds of scriptural quotations spoken (or, perhaps more precisely, inspired) by the Spirit. We have already looked at one series of examples of prosopological exegesis from the Spirit in *Dial.* 56.14–15 centered upon the notion of Trinitarian testimony, and so we might be surprised to learn that this is not how Justin typically envisions the relationship between the Spirit and the words of the Old Testament. Justin begins with an instance in which the Spirit speaks of things in the future:

And when the prophetic Spirit (τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα) speaks as prophesying things that are to come to pass, it speaks in this way: *For the law will go forth from Zion and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and he will judge in the midst of the nations and will reprove a great people; and they will beat their swords into ploughs and their spears into pruning hooks. And nation will not lift up sword against nation, and no longer will they learn war* [Isa 2:3–4].<sup>80</sup>

Curiously, whereas in 1 *Apol.* 37–38 we read of quotations that were spoken “from the person of the Father” and “from the person of Christ,” there is here no language of quotations that are spoken “from the person of the Spirit.”<sup>81</sup>

79 Justin thus employs a Wisdom Christology, emphasizing Christ's pre-existence, that identifies the Son as the personification of Wisdom who speaks the key words about his pre-existence and role in creation in Prov 8:22–31; cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 388.

80 1 *Apol.* 39.1 (SC 507:230): “Ὅταν δὲ ὡς προφητεύον τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι λαλή τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, οὕτως λέγει· Ἐκ γὰρ Σιών ἐξελεύσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνά μέσον ἐθνῶν καὶ ἐλέγξει λαὸν πολύν· καὶ συγχόψουσι τὰς μαχαίρας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰς ζιβύνας αὐτῶν εἰς ὀρέπανα. καὶ οὐ μὴ λήθονται ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος μάχαιραν καὶ οὐ μὴ μάθωσιν ἔτι πολεμεῖν.

81 Recall too 1 *Apol.* 36.1–2 (SC 507:224–226).



Indeed, because the Spirit was identified as the one speaking “as” the Father or the Son, it would appear that there is no need for the Spirit to speak from its own person; as such, in these examples the words of the prophets are simply attributed to the inspiring power of the Spirit rather than presented as the speech of the Spirit as its own distinct person in the theodramatic setting. As already noted, when the Spirit speaks in this inspiring, secondary capacity, the personality of the Spirit is thus considerably diminished; whereas the characters of the Father and of the Son can participate in dialogue with one another, the Spirit appears to have no true voice or identity of its own in these prophetic passages, suggesting a more impersonal view of the Spirit. Rather, Justin seems to be merely claiming that the prophets were inspired by the Spirit, a view with which Trypho and other Jewish teachers of the time would not have disagreed.<sup>82</sup>

We find the same view of the Spirit as an inspiring secondary agent when Justin then gives further examples of the Spirit’s future-tense prophecies concerning Christ and the Church, attributing Ps 19:2–5 and Ps 1–2 to “the prophetic Spirit.”<sup>83</sup> Finally, Justin attributes a prophecy about Christ’s exaltation to the prophetic Spirit, but the past-tense prophecy in his version of Ps 96:10 that “the Lord has reigned from the tree”<sup>84</sup> launches an extended excursus about how the Spirit is justified in prophesying about Christ in the past tense on account of the fact that what is prophesied will certainly come to pass.<sup>85</sup> Indeed, as we have seen throughout all of these examples, “the prophetic Spirit” speaks through Scripture when it prophesies concerning Christ (and, by extension, the Church).

With this in mind, we should not be surprised that the vast majority of instances in which “the Holy Spirit” or “the prophetic Spirit” speaks involve such prophecies,<sup>86</sup> as summarized on the following pages in Table 3.

---

82 Stanton, “Spirit,” 334.

83 *1 Apol.* 40 (SC 507:232–236).

84 On Justin’s version of this psalm, see further Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 35–40.

85 *1 Apol.* 41–43 (SC 507:236–242). “We propose that it was the possibility of reading prophecies as telling of real past events that might have excused those who thus misunderstood them, and that needed therefore to be explained” (Minns and Parvis, *Justin*, 189 n. 3).

86 As with the Father and the Son, we again see a variety of names for the same divine person; in this case, “the prophetic Spirit” is also frequently referred to as “the Holy Spirit.” It appears that there is no pattern for distinguishing one usage from the other, and they are even used jointly in one instance; cf. *1 Apol.* 32.1–2 (SC 507:212).

TABLE 3 *Old Testament passages ascribed to the Spirit in the writings of Justin*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Dial.</i> 25.1–5 (PTS 47:110–111)	Isa 63:15–64:12	the Holy Spirit	presents the words of Israel to God
<i>Dial.</i> 32.6 (PTS 47:123)	Ps 110:1–7 (LXX 109:1–7)	the holy prophetic Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 32.3, 33.2)	intra-divine testimony (the Son is Lord)
<i>Dial.</i> 34.3–6 (PTS 47:125)	Ps 72:1–20 (LXX 71:1–20)	the Holy Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 34.1)	prophesies Christ's reign
<i>Dial.</i> 36.3–4 (PTS 47:130)	Ps 24:1–10 (LXX 23:1–10)	the Holy Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 36.2, 6)	intra-divine testimony (the Son is Lord and God)
<i>Dial.</i> 37.3–4 (PTS 47:131–132)	Ps 99:1–9 (LXX 98:1–9)	the Holy Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 37.2)	intra-divine testimony (the Son is Lord and God)
<i>Dial.</i> 43.3 (PTS 47:140)	Isa 53:5, 8	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ's passion
<i>Dial.</i> 43.5–6 (PTS 47:140)	Isa 7:10–17, 8:4	the prophetic Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 43.4)	prophesies Christ's nativity
<i>Dial.</i> 52.1–2 (PTS 47:155)	Gen 49:8–12	the Holy Spirit	prophesies Christ's reign
<i>Dial.</i> 53.3 (PTS 47:157)	Zech 9:9	the prophetic Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 53.4)	prophesies Christ's triumphal entry
<i>Dial.</i> 54.1 (PTS 47:158–159)	Gen 49:11	the Holy Spirit	prophesies Christ and the Church
<i>Dial.</i> 55.2 (PTS 47:160)	Ps 96:5 (LXX 95:5)	the Holy Spirit	declares idols are not gods
<i>Dial.</i> 56.12 (PTS 47:164)	Gen 19:24	the Holy Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 56.14)	Trinitarian testimony (Father and Son are Lord and God)
<i>Dial.</i> 56.14 (PTS 47:164)	Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1), 45:6–7 (LXX 44:7–8)	the Holy Spirit	Trinitarian testimony (Father and Son are Lord and God)
<i>Dial.</i> 73.3–5 (PTS 47:196)	Ps 96:1–13 (LXX 95:1–13)	the Holy Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 74.2)	prophesies Christ's reign
<i>Dial.</i> 77.4 (PTS 47:204)	Ezek 16:3	the Holy Spirit	speaks against Jerusalem
<i>Dial.</i> 78.8 (PTS 47:205)	Jer 31:15 (LXX 38:15)	the Holy Spirit	prophesies Christ's nativity

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Dial.</i> 84.1 (PTS 47:215)	Isa 7:14	the Holy Spirit	prophesies Christ's nativity
<i>Dial.</i> 91.4 (PTS 47:228)	cf. Gen 3:14; Isa 27:1	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ's passion
<i>Dial.</i> 114.2 (PTS 47:265–266)	Isa 53:7, 65:2, 53:1	the Holy Spirit	prophesies Christ's passion
<i>Dial.</i> 114.3 (PTS 47:266)	Ps 8:4	the Holy Spirit	speaks to Christ about his work in creation
<i>Dial.</i> 124.2–4 (PTS 47:284–285)	Ps 82:1–8 (LXX 81:1–8)	the Holy Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 124.1)	prophesies Christ and the Church
<i>Dial.</i> 139.3 (PTS 47:310)	Gen 9:24–27	the prophetic Spirit (cf. <i>Dial.</i> 139.1)	prophesies Christ and the Church
1 <i>Apol.</i> 32.1–2 (SC 507:212–214)	Gen 49:10–11	the divine and holy prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ's ministry (to Gentiles)
1 <i>Apol.</i> 33.1–2 (SC 507:216–218)	Isa 7:14	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ's nativity
1 <i>Apol.</i> 35.3 (SC 507:222)	Isa 65:2, 58:2; Ps 22:16, 18 (LXX 21:17, 19)	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ's passion
1 <i>Apol.</i> 39.1 (SC 507:230)	Isa 2:3–4	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ and the Church
1 <i>Apol.</i> 40.1–4 (SC 507:232)	Ps 19:2–5 (LXX 18:3–6)	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ and the Church
1 <i>Apol.</i> 40.5–19 (SC 507:232–236)	Ps 1–2	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ and the Church
1 <i>Apol.</i> 41.1–4 (SC 507:238)	Ps 96:1–2, 4–10 (LXX 95:1–2, 4–10)	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ's reign
1 <i>Apol.</i> 48.4–6 (SC 507:254)	Isa 57:1–2	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ's passion
1 <i>Apol.</i> 51.1–5 (SC 507:260)	Isa 53:8–12	the prophetic Spirit	prophesies Christ's passion and reign
1 <i>Apol.</i> 59.1–4 (SC 507:282)	Gen 1:1–3	the prophetic Spirit	describes the creation of the world
1 <i>Apol.</i> 60.8–9 (SC 507:286)	Deut 32:22	the prophetic Spirit	describes the judgment of the world
1 <i>Apol.</i> 63.2, 12 (SC 507:294–298)	Isa 1:3	the prophetic Spirit	presents the words of God to Israel

This table reveals that there are two major categories in which we can organize these different examples of the Spirit's speech.<sup>87</sup> The vast majority of these instances follow the pattern set out in *1 Apol.* 39–45, with the Spirit speaking through Scripture, albeit not theodramatically as a distinct divine person, in order to inspire prophecy concerning Christ and the Church. We are, therefore, still in the realm of the Spirit functioning as an inspiring secondary agent, but without any reference to testimony to other divine persons.

This usage contrasts with the manner in which the Spirit appears to speak theodramatically as its own distinct person, able to testify as a primary speaking agent to the divinity of the other divine persons, as seen in most of the instances in *Dial.* 56.14–15.<sup>88</sup> The verbs attributed to the Spirit in *Dial.* 56.14–15, θεολογέω and κυριολογέω, demand their subject have a unique voice and identity, or perhaps a “character” or “person,” capable of providing testimony, which seems to go beyond simply inspiring the prophets concerning the coming Christ. To reiterate, whereas in most instances the Spirit merely inspires prophecy or speaks in the guise of another, there are times in which the Spirit itself puts on a mask and becomes a character who is in dialogue with other divine persons, like an author inserting himself into his own play.

Still, recalling the case of Gen 19:24, we need to be careful not to push this distinction between the Spirit as primary or secondary agent too hard, as Justin seems to have seen things in less clear categories, suggesting that we may need to come at the issue from another angle in order to better capture the dynamics at work in Justin's writing.<sup>89</sup> In the case of Gen 19:24, we have argued that

87 A third, and more minor grouping, would include the theme of creation and judgment of the world, found in *1 Apol.* 59–60 (SC 507:282–288). We may also note some overlap with the themes typically associated with other divine persons; for instance, the condemnation of Israel's sin in *Dial.* 25.1–5 (PTS 47:110–111) and *1 Apol.* 63.2, 12 (SC 507:294, 296–298) is more commonly ascribed to the person of the Father. While Justin seems to generally follow certain patterns, we should certainly not think of these as fixed or unbreakable rules.

88 To put it in other words, in texts of this nature, “the idea of person is derived from the dialogue character of the text”; so Eric Osborn, *The Emergence of Christian Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 191.

89 Indeed, in an earlier article I claimed that “all of the texts explicitly and exclusively assigned to the Spirit have to do with testimony concerning the Father and the Son,” while “when the Spirit speaks in the *prosopon* of another, this kind of testimony is *not* in view.” Further reflection on Justin's use of Gen 19:24 has, however, convinced me that this statement needs to be modified in light of this exception. See Kyle R. Hughes, “The Spirit Speaks: Pneumatological Innovation in the Scriptural Exegesis of Justin and Tertullian,” *VC* 69 (2015): 473.

the Spirit is not acting as a primary speaking agent, as there is no dialogue for the Spirit to participate in, and yet the Spirit still seems to function as a more active, distinct, and personal being (note again the use of the verb *κυριολογέω*) than it otherwise tends to be as an inspiring secondary agent.<sup>90</sup> Thus, we concluded that the Spirit's prosopological testimony to the other divine persons transcends the boundary between primary and secondary speech; the common element, in every case, is not so much the *means* of the Spirit's testimony as it is the *content* of the testimony. Again, though, we must recognize that this understanding of the Spirit exists in Justin alongside of a more common approach that appears to limit the personality of the Spirit by simply presenting it as the inspiring force behind the words of the prophets and even other divine "characters" who speak in the Old Testament.

If this distinction is not as clear-cut as we modern readers might like, it may not have been entirely clear to Justin himself, as a further instance of a liminal case involving the Spirit sheds additional light on some of the complexities related to his presentation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. In *Dial.* 36, Justin is in the midst of a lengthy argument (*Dial.* 10–47) in which he seeks to demonstrate the superiority of the new law and the new covenant in Christ.<sup>91</sup> At this point in the debate, Trypho has demanded proof that Jesus is in fact the Messiah, predicted by Scripture, who would be glorified and given the titles of Judge, Eternal King, and Priest.<sup>92</sup> Justin then tells Trypho that he will demonstrate from Scripture a prophecy in which "Christ, by the Holy Spirit, is called in parable 'God' and 'Lord of Hosts' and '[God] of Jacob.'" <sup>93</sup> Though Justin argues that the Jews mistakenly applied these prophecies to Solomon, he contends that they in fact refer to Christ. The prophecy that Justin has in mind, which he then goes on to quote, is Ps 24.<sup>94</sup> For Justin, this can only speak of Christ's

90 Though I continue to use Bates's labels of "primary speaking agent" and "inspiring secondary agent" as helpful categories for distinguishing between these two approaches to the Spirit's relationship to the words of Scripture, the impersonal view of the Spirit would seem to suggest that the Spirit is not an agent insofar as that term is usually associated with some degree of personhood. Bates does not really define what he means by "agent," and it is not clear that agency is even the best category for this discussion; in any event, in light of the lack of better terms available in the literature, I will continue to use them even as I hold these reservations.

91 Cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 166–182.

92 *Dial.* 36.1 (PTS 47:130).

93 *Dial.* 36.2 (PTS 47:130): καὶ θεός καὶ κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Ἰακώβ καλεῖται ἐν παραβολῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

94 *Dial.* 36.3–4 (PTS 47:130–131).

ascension, and as a result he links the psalm with a christological interpretation of Ps 110:1 to emphasize Christ's present reign.<sup>95</sup> Justin brings his analysis of Ps 24 to a close by making the following observation:

For when the heavenly rulers saw that his appearance was unsightly, dishonored, and inglorious, not recognizing him, they inquired, *Who is this King of Glory?* And the Holy Spirit, either from the person of the Father or from its own person (ἢ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου) answered, *The Lord of Hosts. He is the King of Glory* [Ps 24:10 (LXX 23:10)].<sup>96</sup>

Here Justin expresses uncertainty about how to prosopologically exegete this passage. The “King of Glory,” Justin has already determined, is the Son after his ascension. But to whom should we ascribe the dialogue in this text? Justin, drawing upon Isa 53:2–3 for his description of the Messiah, asserts that it is none other than the “heavenly rulers” (οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἄρχοντες) who ask, “Who is this King of Glory?”<sup>97</sup> The trouble comes, however, when Justin tries to pin down the identity of the voice who responds to the heavenly rulers, and he admits that he is unsure whether the response comes from the Spirit speaking from the person of the Father (ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς) or from its own person (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου).

There are three critical things to note about Justin's use of prosopological exegesis in *Dial.* 36.6. First, as previously stated we have evidence that Justin, beyond a shadow of a doubt, believes that the Spirit could do more than just inspire prophets or speak in the person of another (in this case, the Father). For Justin, the Spirit could actually speak from its own person. The fact that Justin

95 *Dial.* 36.5 (PTS 47:131).

96 *Dial.* 36.6 (PTS 47:131): Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἄρχοντες ἑώρων ἀειδῆ καὶ ἄτιμον τὸ εἶδος καὶ ἄδοξον ἔχοντα αὐτόν, οὐ γνωρίζοντες αὐτόν, ἐπυνθάνοντο· Τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης; Καὶ ἀποκρίνεται αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἢ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου· Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, αὐτὸς οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης. On Justin's text of Ps 24 see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 82–84.

97 Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, trans. and ed. John A. Baker, vol. 1 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), 261, notes the interesting development that occurred when this psalm was interpreted with respect to the ascension: the fact that the heavenly rulers do not recognize Jesus leads to the conclusion that the angels are astonished and do not recognize the Word because the Word is now united to human flesh. Justin, according to Daniélou, is the first to discuss this theme; see likewise Irenaeus's interpretation in *Epid.* 84 (SC 406:196–198).

lays out the two options side-by-side provides further justification for distinguishing between when the Spirit speaks as an inspiring secondary agent and when the Spirit speaks as a primary speaking agent in intra-divine dialogue.

Second, though, and key to our whole argument is the following: the description of the Spirit's words in *Dial.* 36.6 has a great deal in common with those we have already looked at in *Dial.* 56.14–15. When Justin invokes the Spirit in *Dial.* 36.2, he says that the passage he will quote demonstrates that the Spirit “calls” (καλεῖται) Christ “God and Lord” (θεὸς καὶ κύριος). This is semantically equivalent to the verbs θεολογέω and κυριολογέω, which Justin applied to the Spirit in *Dial.* 56.14–15. What this shows, therefore, is that in both instances in which Justin indicates the Spirit is speaking from its own person, the Spirit is engaged in testifying to the deity of the Father and/or the Son. That the Spirit in both cases is presented as providing intra-divine testimony simply cannot be a coincidence.

Third, yet equally illuminating, is the fact that Justin nevertheless has some trouble identifying the Spirit as the primary speaking agent of *Dial.* 36.6. In *Dial.* 56.14, we saw that all of the texts in which the Spirit was the primary speaking agent were “two powers” texts, wherein the Spirit directly addressed one member of the Godhead concerning another member of the Godhead; in other words, the Spirit was providing testimony about God to God. Here, in *Dial.* 36.6, the Spirit is performing a similar and yet slightly different action, providing testimony about Christ to the heavenly rulers (οἱ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἄρχοντες). Justin may have been caught between following two different patterns: that of having the Spirit be the source of ascribing deity and lordship to Christ and that of having the Father be the source of divine speech concerning the Son outside of “two powers” texts. Perhaps, for Justin, the heavenly rulers could serve as a suitable “divine” alternative addressee (as opposed to earthly personae such as human beings or Israel, as in almost all of the instances in which the Spirit is the inspiring secondary agent) to the Father. That the Spirit is only testifying to the deity and lordship of the Son, and not the Father as well, further sets this example apart from the examples in *Dial.* 56.14, meaning that this case of intra-divine testimony does not rise to the level of what we are calling Trinitarian testimony. In any event, Justin's uncertainty regarding this liminal case actually serves to strengthen my hypothesis that there are two different (though not entirely distinct in Justin's own mind) methods by which the Spirit is said to speak through the Old Testament. This passage also strengthens my claim that when the Spirit is presented as speaking from its own person it is always in the context of testimony to the divinity and lordship of another divine person.

The extension of Justin's argument into *Dial.* 37 is also of interest for our study, as Table 3 indicates that this is the one instance besides *Dial.* 56.14–15

in which the Spirit testifies prosopologically to the Son. The first quotation in this chapter, Ps 47:5–9, is introduced with only the comment that this psalm “is thus said with respect to Christ” (εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν οὕτως εἴρηται), leaving it unclear whether or not the Spirit is to be understood as the primary speaking agent of this quotation.<sup>98</sup> Nevertheless, Justin introduces the next quotation in this chapter, Ps 99, with the note that in this psalm “the Holy Spirit reprimands you and declares that this one, whom you do not desire to be king, is the King and Lord of Samuel and Aaron and Moses, and, indeed, every other person.”<sup>99</sup> Justin has again found an Old Testament quotation that he believes testifies to the lordship of the Son, and he has yet again assigned that quotation to the Spirit. Read in this light, the words of Ps 99 are particularly interesting insofar as the Spirit appears to have two distinct audiences even within this one psalm, as evidenced, for instance, in verses 8–9: “O Lord our God, you heard them. O God, you were merciful to them, though avenging all their practices. Exalt the Lord our God and worship at his holy mountain, for the Lord our God is holy.”<sup>100</sup> On the one hand, the Spirit is exhorting Israel to worship Jesus as God; on the other, the Spirit is directly addressing the Son and testifying to his mercy and justice. It appears, therefore, that the Spirit is testifying about the Son both to Israel as well as to the Son himself, with the emphasis in both on the Son’s identity as Lord and God. The Spirit’s testimony to the Son is significant because the Spirit’s testimony is again occurring in the context of dialogue with another divine person; by participating in this divine discourse, the Spirit is again cast in terms of a genuine character and therefore can be described as the primary speaking agent of this text.<sup>101</sup> In any event, the fact that the Spirit

98 Justin interprets this text christologically with reference to Christ’s ascension, just as he did with Ps 24 in *1 Apol.* 36 (PTS 47:130–131). On Justin’s use of Ps 47, see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 177.

99 *Dial.* 37.2 (PTS 47:131–132): ὁνειδίζει ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, καὶ τοῦτον, ὃν μὴ θέλετε βασιλέα εἶναι, βασιλέα καὶ κύριον καὶ τοῦ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τοῦ Ἀαρῶν καὶ Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ἀπλῶς ὄντα μνηύει.

100 *Dial.* 37.4 (PTS 47:132): Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, σὺ ἐπήκουες αὐτῶν· ὁ θεός, σὺ εὐίλατος ἐγένου αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκδικῶν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν. Ὑψοῦτε κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν καὶ προσκυνεῖτε εἰς ὅρος ἅγιον αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. On Justin’s text of Ps 99, see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 176.

101 Still another interesting text is *Dial.* 55.2 (PTS 47:160), in which the Spirit declares through David that the gods of the Gentiles are in fact not true gods; this is something of an inverse of the intra-divine testimony of the Spirit, for here the Spirit is describing idols as *not* being divine. No testimony language or other (true) divine persons are involved in this quotation, however, and the Spirit appears to be speaking in simply a secondary, inspiring capacity.



is testifying to only the Son and not the Father as well would again mean that this instance of intra-divine testimony does not rise to the level of being called Trinitarian testimony.

To summarize, Justin uses prosopological exegesis to carve out a unique role for the Spirit as the source of testimony to the other divine persons. We have seen that Justin employs this ancient reading technique in such a way as to have the Spirit personally participate in intra-divine dialogue, and observed that every time the Spirit speaks in this way it is for the purpose of providing testimony to another divine person or persons. Finally, and most importantly, we observed that though the Father and the Son are capable of participating in intra-divine dialogue with one another (but never the Spirit), Justin never identifies either of those divine persons as a source of intra-divine (much less Trinitarian) testimony. As such, we can conclude with confidence that the Spirit indeed has a unique role in providing testimony to the divinity or lordship of the Father and the Son.

### Justin and His Sources

Our next topic concerns the question of whether, when Justin reads the Old Testament in such a way that the Spirit provides testimony to the deity or lordship of the Father and the Son, this particular pattern of reading should be credited to Justin as his own innovation or should be attributed to something else, such as the sources Justin made use of in composing his works.

Answering this question requires acknowledging the likelihood that early Christians gathered together and edited groups of quotations from the Hebrew Bible, to which they attached certain authoritative interpretations, to function as proof-texts in defense of important early Christian beliefs.<sup>102</sup> The conclusion that there existed such written *testimonia* collections in the first and second centuries has substantial implications for our understanding of Justin's sources. Indeed, Justin himself quotes extensively from what he calls "testimonies" (μαρτύρια), which he uses to demonstrate how Christianity fulfills the Hebrew Scriptures.<sup>103</sup> The landmark contribution to the study of Justin's use of

102 Albl, *Scripture*, xv. On the *testimonia* hypothesis in general, see further Albl, *Scripture*, 7–69.

103 Cf., e.g., 1 *Apol.* 53.2 (SC 507:268). It is worth noting that, for Justin, "the μαρτύρια of the scriptures is in turn based on the absolute reliability of the prophets, who are themselves μαρτυρες of the truth" (Albl, *Scripture*, 102); cf. *Dial.* 7.2 (PTS 47:83).

*testimonia* is undoubtedly that of Oskar Skarsaune.<sup>104</sup> After dismissing an alternative thesis that Justin's biblical quotations and their accompanying exegesis derived from Justin's lost *Syntagma* (and that, in turn, Irenaeus and Tertullian depended on the *Syntagma* and not Justin's extant writings),<sup>105</sup> Skarsaune puts forward the claims that, first, Justin's short, non-LXX quotations are taken from written *testimonia* collections, and that, second, Justin's longer LXX quotations are copied from the biblical manuscripts in Justin's possession.<sup>106</sup> Having demonstrated this, Skarsaune delineates and analyzes two units of tradition from Justin's extensive sets of Old Testament testimonies.<sup>107</sup> Skarsaune terms the first of these the "kerygma source" on account of the fact that many of these proof-texts (besides those that have an anti-cultic force) appear to follow a creedal sequence, tracing how various aspects of Jesus's life and death demonstrate that he is in fact the prophesied Messiah.<sup>108</sup> Skarsaune shows that Justin appears to mark his quotations and the corresponding interpretations derived from this source according to a common pattern,<sup>109</sup> and as such, following Skarsaune, we may infer that this source stands behind *1 Apol.* 31–35,

104 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*. As Slusser ("Justin Scholarship," 16) notes, Skarsaune's work represents the most thorough attempt to uncover Justin's sources for *Dial.*, and is responsible for launching a new period of Justin scholarship that Slusser terms the study of the "Justin of the *Dialogue*." Prior to Skarsaune's magisterial work, see Chadwick, "Justin's Defence," 281–282; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 111–119; Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 67–74.

105 See, e.g., Pierre Prigent, *Justin et l'Ancien Testament*, Études Bibliques (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1964). Cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 3–6, 435–453.

106 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 8, 17–131; cf. idem, "Justin and His Bible," in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 55–61. Skarsaune ("Justin and His Bible," 57–58) suggests that these LXX manuscripts were likely produced by Jewish scribes in scroll format, with Genesis, Isaiah, and Psalms being the scrolls from which Justin quotes most frequently. For summary, see Albl, *Scripture*, 102–104.

107 We should probably not think of these as single written documents; rather, following Bousset, Skarsaune finds it more likely that each source was comprised of "a connected series of tracts, perhaps circulating within a 'school' tradition" (*Proof from Prophecy*, 228).

108 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 228–234. Albl (*Scripture*, 105) summarizes how this source follows a "two advent pattern," showing how Jesus fulfills prophecies related to suffering in his first advent and will fulfill those related to glory in his second.

109 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 140: "(A) The relevant scriptural phrase is quoted, introduced by τὸ δὲ (εἰρημένον) ... Next (B), there follows a short exegesis of the exact meaning of the scriptural phrase, introduced by the words σημαίνει or μηνύει or equivalents. Finally (C), a short historical narrative is appended, in which the historical fulfilment of the prophecy is pointed out." On Justin's sources also including interpretations utilized by Justin, see idem, "Justin and His Bible," 58; likewise, Albl (*Scripture*, 102) argues that "in his work

48, 50–53, as well as these chapters' parallels in *Dial.* (namely, chs. 11–47 and 108–141).<sup>110</sup> Besides the kerygma source, Skarsaune posits the existence of a “recapitulation source,” found in *Dial.* 48–108, in which Justin strives to demonstrate that certain scriptural quotations refer not to any of the historical kings of Israel but to Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>111</sup> These blocks of quotations, Skarsaune suggests, represent two distinct streams of tradition: the kerygma source may be understood as representative of Jewish Christians engaging with other Jews in the turmoil of the years following the Bar Kochba revolt, whereas the recapitulation source may represent a newly emboldened Gentile Christianity.<sup>112</sup> Though not every scholar accepts every detail of Skarsaune's hypothesis, it nevertheless remains the most detailed and persuasive attempt in the literature at reconstructing Justin's sources.<sup>113</sup> As such, despite the fact that Skarsaune's very plausible hypothesis obviously cannot be proven in an absolute way, I am content to critically build my argument upon the work of Skarsaune. Having noted that Skarsaune finds extensive evidence of Justin making use of written *testimonia* collections, we may then wonder to what extent the link between the Spirit and testimony to the deity or lordship of the Father and the Son that we have observed in Justin's writings should be attributed to Justin as opposed to his sources. It is my contention that this link is in fact likely an innovation of Justin.

Our first piece of evidence for this conclusion is that Justin interprets the proof-texts in these passages in a way that is very different from how they would have been interpreted in their original textual settings within the Old Testament, beginning with Justin's description and examples of prosopological exegesis found in *1 Apol.* 36–45. As discussed above, these chapters form part of Justin's “great insertion” (*1 Apol.* 36–49), which seeks to demonstrate the manner in which Christians read the Old Testament prosopologically. The key point

---

of handing on the proper scriptural interpretations in his [testimony collections], Justin understood himself as continuing the apostolic tradition.”

110 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 140–157.

111 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 234–242. As Albl (*Scripture*, 106) summarizes, while both Justin and Trypho agree that certain passages apply to the Messiah, the debate is over whether or not Jesus is in fact this Messiah. Skarsaune (*Proof from Prophecy*, 234) suggests that this recapitulation source may in fact be identical with Aristo of Pella's lost *Controversy between Jason and Papisclus*.

112 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 372–373.

113 On the significance of Skarsaune's work, see Slusser, “Justin Scholarship,” 16–17; Skarsaune's work is indeed referenced in many of the other essays in the edited volume of Parvis and Foster.

to make about these chapters is that, as even a superficial reading of these chapters indicates and as Skarsaune's more detailed analysis has confirmed, many of the quotations do not appear to prove the points that Justin claims to be making, suggesting that Justin is drawing upon testimony sources that were made for other purposes.<sup>114</sup> For example, none of the quotations given as from the character of the Father in *1 Apol.* 37 are prophecies, as *1 Apol.* 36 would lead us to expect; rather, Justin likely drew on an anti-cultic source, at least for the last two of the quotations.<sup>115</sup> The key implication here is that Justin did not have a testimony source that provided examples of prosopological exegesis from different speakers; rather, he is pulling these examples together himself. If, then, we can argue that Justin's overview of (and therefore perhaps particular attention to) prosopological exegesis is original to him, it is at least highly plausible that many, if not all, of the specific instances of prosopological exegesis scattered throughout his works are original to him and not to one of his sources.<sup>116</sup>

With this in mind, we must now engage with the scholarly debate concerning how much of Justin's interpretation of the Old Testament theophanies in *Dial.* 56–60, within which our key passage on the Spirit falls, is original to Justin. Drawing on the work of Benedict Kominiak and Demetrius Trakatellis,<sup>117</sup> Skarsaune has provided the most vigorous defense of the position that these chapters represent Justin's own exegesis; it is noteworthy that although Skarsaune has, more than anyone else, demonstrated Justin's reliance on *testimonia*, he nevertheless concludes that Justin's treatment of scriptural theophanies in *Dial.* 56–60 is one of two exceptions in which we find Justin clearly engaging in extensive original exegesis.<sup>118</sup> Although traditional *testimonia* collections contained "two powers" proof-texts such as Ps 110:1, Ps 45:7, and (perhaps) Gen 19:24,<sup>119</sup> Justin takes the argument in a new direction by invoking

114 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 157.

115 For a possible reconstruction of Justin's method in finding these quotations, see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 158.

116 It is, of course, conceivable that Justin was dependent on another source beyond those proposed by Skarsaune for these ideas (and, indeed, those described in the following paragraph); we can never be certain that an author's ideas were truly "original" when we lack full knowledge of all of the sources at an author's disposal, but in the absence of the discovery of any new manuscript evidence or theory of the nature of Justin's sources, crediting this innovation to Justin is the most plausible explanation.

117 Kominiak, *Theophanies*, 23–58; Trakatellis, *Pre-Existence*, 53–92.

118 The other exception, according to Skarsaune ("Justin and His Bible," 61), is Justin's commentary on Ps 22:1–23 in *Dial.* 97–107 (PTS 47:236–254).

119 Ps 110:1, in particular, was used extensively throughout early Christian writings (see again Hay, *Glory*). For instance, Ps 110:1 appears often in the New Testament (Matt 22:43–44; Mark

the entirety of Gen 18–19 as a way of rethinking the very nature of the Old Testament theophanies. Thus, according to Skarsaune, Justin went beyond mere proof-texting to “develop an entirely new hermeneutical concept, namely, that the biblical theophanies should be understood to be approaches not of the Father, but of the *Logos*, his Son.”<sup>120</sup> On this account, Justin’s linking of the Spirit with Trinitarian testimony in *Dial.* 56.14–15 is almost certainly a unique feature of Justin’s exegesis.

However, in a recent article challenging the prevailing view, Bogdan G. Bucur has argued that evidence for an older tradition that also used this sort of christological reading can be found in Justin’s writings and in Melito of Sardis’s *On the Passover*, which dates from the late second century.<sup>121</sup> Even if Bucur’s position is adopted, it is surely significant that the passages cited as evidence by Bucur do not include anything about prosopological exegesis or about the role of the Spirit. Combined, therefore, with what we have already seen concerning how Justin has taken over traditional materials for his own ends (namely, for the sake of applying prosopological exegesis), it seems more probable than not that Justin was indeed the originator of this particular understanding of the Spirit’s role. Furthermore, if (as will be discussed below) Justin crafted this argument at least in part in response to Marcion, it becomes quite easy to see how and why Justin has updated the interpretation of these particular proof-texts for his own day and age. Thus, unless a newly discovered text demonstrates otherwise, I am content to credit the theological innovation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit to Justin.

---

12:35–37; Luke 20:42–43; Acts 2:32–36; Heb 1:13) and in other early Christian literature, as at *Barn.* 12.10 (LCL 25:60). Cf. Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 257–258; Will Rutherford, “*Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci* as a Testimony Source for Justin’s ‘Second God’ Argument?” in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 139. On the question of whether Gen 19:24 was included alongside these quotations from the Psalter in early *testimonia* collections, Skarsaune (*Proof from Prophecy*, 209 n. 62) suggests it is likely, but Rutherford (“Justin’s ‘Second God’ Argument,” 139) thinks it more plausible that Justin “discovered” the quotation himself in light of his thorough command of the text’s larger scriptural context.

120 Skarsaune, “Justin and His Bible,” 63. In particular, Justin moved beyond the traditional proof-text approach, which focused on how Jesus fulfilled messianic prophecies, to finding evidence for Jesus’s divinity from the narrative portions of Genesis and Exodus. As Skarsaune elsewhere (*Proof from Prophecy*, 211) concludes, “One can hardly escape the impression that Justin has an inventor’s pride with regard to his argument in *Dial.* 56–60.” For summary, see Rokéah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews*, 26–28.

121 Bogdan G. Bucur, “Justin Martyr’s Exegesis of Biblical Theophanies and the Parting of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism,” *TS* 75 (2014): 45–46.

As one final point, however, we must consider whether or not Justin derived the notion of the Spirit's testifying speech in *Dial.* 36.6 from another source, or whether this too is unique to him. As with Ps 110, Ps 24 was almost certainly originally used as a *testimonia* to Christ's ascension; besides in *Dial.* 36.5, the combination of Ps 24 and Ps 110 can be found, falsely ascribed to Justin, in *Refutation of All Heresies* 5.26.15–17.<sup>122</sup> This indicates that there is evidence that these texts circulated together from an early time.<sup>123</sup> Importantly for our purposes, however, is the fact that another text, the *Physiologus*, also casts the Spirit as the speaker of the words to the heavenly rulers in Ps 24:10, though in this instance it was applied to Christ's descent rather than to his ascent.<sup>124</sup> Jean Daniélou seems to hint that this reading of Ps 24:10 goes back to a tradition earlier than both Justin and the *Physiologus*, arguing that the Spirit's speech "is an archaic feature, which was later to disappear entirely, and is thus an argument in favour of the antiquity of the tradition recorded by the *Physiologos*."<sup>125</sup> However, Alan Scott has recently demonstrated that the *Physiologus* most likely dates from no earlier than the second half of the third century,<sup>126</sup> and the simplest explanation would appear to be that the author(s) of the *Physiologus* has adapted Justin's exegesis of Ps 24:10 for his own purposes. Justin, therefore, also appears to have been the first to read the Spirit as the speaker of the response to the heavenly rulers in Ps 24:10, concurring with our analysis of *Dial.* 56.14–15 above.

### Historical-Theological Context: Justin and Early Christian Self-Definition

Unlike his successors Irenaeus and Tertullian, Justin does not clearly define the role of the Spirit within his broader theological schema. Still, we can deepen our understanding of *why* Justin may have linked the Spirit with Trinitarian testimony (as well as intra-divine testimony more broadly) by considering his particular historical context and the nature of the theological challenges that may have motivated this pneumatological development. While Justin's argument in

<sup>122</sup> Hippolytus, *Haer.* 5.26.15–17 (PTS 25:204).

<sup>123</sup> Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 259–260.

<sup>124</sup> Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 261.

<sup>125</sup> Daniélou, *Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 262; indeed, later patristic authors who comment on Ps 24 do not identify the Spirit as the speaker of the answer to the heavenly rulers, as at Origen, *Comm. John* 6.288 (SC 157:348–350).

<sup>126</sup> Alan Scott, "The Date of the *Physiologus*," VC 52 (1998): 430–441.

*Dial.* 56.14–15 is readily understandable, the opponent Justin had in mind is much less obvious. In this section, we will consider three such contexts, examining Justin's engagement with Judaism, Marcionism, and Middle Platonism. Throughout, we must bear in mind that Justin was participating in a broader process of early Christian self-definition, in which proto-orthodox Christianity struggled to define itself with respect to Judaism, other Christian groups deemed heretical, and new understandings of Platonic philosophy. Thus, we must be particularly sensitive to the reality that Justin is in fact *constructing* the identities of these various groups rather than objectively reporting the existence of groupings that may have lacked clearly delimited boundaries in the eyes of many, if not most, of Justin's contemporaries. We must also be sensitive to the likelihood that Justin is concurrently engaging, to various extents, several different opponents; I find it unhelpful to limit our understanding of the influence of Justin's historical context on his argument in *Dial.* 56.14–15 to any one of the above three domains to the exclusion of the other two. Justin has shown himself to be a subtle enough writer that we can easily imagine him engaging with each of these groups at the same time.<sup>127</sup> Assuming, as we will see below, that the broad argument in *Dial.* 56 could fit within any of these three polemical contexts, we must then in each case press the issue of the relationship between the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony, considering which context was the most likely to have generated this particular innovation.

### *Justin and Judaism*

We begin with perhaps the most obvious context in which to place Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56.14–15: the process of Christian self-definition with respect to early Judaism. In Justin's time Judaism and Christianity in many places existed side-by-side, with the boundaries between the two not always sharply defined. As Daniel Boyarin has plausibly insisted, the more sharply defined borders that emerged as early as the late first century were "constructed and imposed" in a complex process of mutual self-definition that transformed somewhat socially differentiated groups into what we now think of as distinct religious communities.<sup>128</sup> As such, it is likely that the best lens by which to read *Dial.* is one

127 For instance, with regards to Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56 (PTS 47:161–167), Judith M. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 24, argues that in his discussion of the theophanies Justin is arguing against *both* the Jews and the Marcionites, taking to task those scholars who insist on privileging one reading to the exclusion of the other.

128 Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, *Divinations* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 1–2. This view is thus distinct from the

in which Justin is actively engaged in publicly constructing a Christian identity that is distinct from that of the Judaism that he believes to be a threat and competitor to his adopted faith.<sup>129</sup>

Even if this purported dialogue with Trypho is a fictionalized account, it is a matter of historical fact that interaction, tension, and hostility between Jews and Christians continued in the first centuries following Christianity's emergence from within Judaism.<sup>130</sup> By all accounts, Justin played a decisive role in the process of fashioning a Christian identity that was distinct from that of Judaism (or at least the version of Judaism that Justin constructed in *Dial.*), a group he defined by its refusal to accept Jesus as the Logos of God.<sup>131</sup> The aspect of this competition most relevant to our study is the extent to which Justin interacted with the rabbis of his day, who offered competing exegetical claims concerning the Hebrew Scriptures.<sup>132</sup> It is in this context that Justin's

---

traditional notion of the "parting of the ways," which often presupposes the pre-existence of these two discrete religious entities.

- 129 This is not to say that Justin did not have multiple audiences in mind as he composed *Dial.*, as is almost certain. Still, Boyarin and other recent works on early Christianity have rightly stressed the need to take this process of self-definition seriously, as opposed to simply accepting that the way that Justin and other apologists presented the world was an accurate representation of reality.
- 130 Among many works stressing the influence of Judaism on the process of early Christian self-definition, see further Robert L. Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971) 9–38; Judith Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996); Reidar Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*, WUNT 2/82 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 213–321; Oskar Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2002), esp. 269–274 on Justin; Tobias Nicklas, *Jews and Christians? Second-Century 'Christian' Perspectives on the 'Parting of the Ways'* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).
- 131 Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 37–73; see also idem, "Justin Martyr Invents Judaism," *CH* 70 (2001): 427–461.
- 132 See further Harold Remus, "Justin Martyr's Argument with Judaism," in *Separation and Polemic*, ed. Stephen G. Wilson, vol. 2 of *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, Studies in Christianity and Judaism 2 (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 59–80. On the diversity of messianic and eschatological hopes in early rabbinic Judaism, see Richard A. Freund, "The Apocalypse according to the Rabbis: Divergent Rabbinic Views on the End of Days," in *Millennialism from the Hebrew Bible to the Present*, ed. Leonard J. Greenspoon and Ronald A. Simkins, SJC 12 (Omaha: Creighton University Press, 2002), 115–133.



*Dial.* is clearly concerned to demonstrate the superiority of Christian exegesis of the Old Testament to that of contemporary Judaism.<sup>133</sup>

The existence of competing exegetical claims from rabbinic Judaism brings us back to *Dial.* 56 and its interpretation of Gen 18–19. The specific issue at stake is that of how to interpret Old Testament passages that appear to speak of “two powers in heaven.” As already noted, this interpretive tradition grew out of Hellenistic Judaism, but by the rabbinic period, in the wake of the emergence of Christianity and Gnosticism with their competing understandings of God, the rabbis rejected it as heresy.<sup>134</sup> Accordingly, rabbinic exegesis interpreted such “two powers” passages in a way that preserved the unity of God. To take just one example, a passage in the Babylonian Talmud that purports to cite a late-second-century tradition provides the following interpretation of Gen 19:24, the key “two powers” text so central to Justin’s exegesis:

A *min* said to R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé, “It is written, ‘Then the Lord caused to rain upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord.’ It should have said, ‘From him.’” A certain laundryman said to him, “Let me answer him. It is written, ‘And Lamech said to his wives, Ada and Zillah, Hear my voice, you wives of Lamech.’ It should have said, ‘my wives.’ But that just is how Scripture says things, and here too, that just is how Scripture says things.” [Ishmael] said to him, “How do you know that?” “I heard it from the public lesson of R. Meir.”<sup>135</sup>

In this passage, the Talmud provides an alternative interpretation of Gen 19:24 that rules out the possibility of it speaking of two gods. Comparing this with

133 The literature on this topic is massive: see, e.g., L.W. Barnard, “The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” *VT* 14 (1964): 395–406; W.A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965), 71–115; David E. Aune, “Justin Martyr’s Use of the Old Testament,” *BETS* 9 (1966): 179–197; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 87–95; Bucur, “Parting of the Ways,” 48–50; Remus, “Argument with Judaism,” 66–72; Allert, *Revelation*, 221–253. Of course, Justin’s method of exegesis was in fact highly indebted to Jewish principles of interpretation; see further Shotwell, *Biblical Exegesis*, 90–93; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 95–97.

134 See further Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 33–155; idem, “‘Two Powers in Heaven’ and Early Christian Trinitarian Thinking,” in *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity*, ed. Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O’Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 73–95.

135 b. Sanh. 38b. Translation from Jacob Neusner, trans., *Bavli Tractate Sanhedrin: Chapters 1 through VII*, vol. 23A of *The Talmud of Babylonia: An Academic Commentary* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 192. I was first pointed to this text by Skarsaune, “Justin and His Bible,” 62.

Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56, Skarsaune concludes that Justin's exegesis "seems almost tailor-made to refute the interpretation advocated by Rabbi Meir in the Talmudic passage."<sup>136</sup> In other words, what we have established to be a highly innovative christological exegesis of Gen 19:24 on the part of Justin was likely to some extent in dialogue with rabbinic Judaism and its interpretation of this passage and others like it. The notion that Justin's exegesis of Gen 19:24 is deliberately engaging with rabbinic exegesis of this same verse is particularly plausible in light of the near certainty that Justin was himself in contact with the writings or ideas of early rabbinic Judaism.<sup>137</sup> Thus, given that the question of Jesus's pre-existence proved to be a stumbling block for many Jews, it requires little imagination to understand Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56 growing out of this conflict with Judaism.

Nevertheless, we still need to account for why Justin links the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony as one element of his broader polemic. Judaism is actually a natural context for this particular innovation, insofar as the blurred boundaries between Jews and Christians during this time allowed for a great deal of overlap between many of the theological beliefs of those who identified with one group and the other. While the claim that Jesus was in fact a "second God" would have been no doubt problematic for the Jews of Justin's day who were less inclined to accept such "two powers" readings of the Hebrew Bible,<sup>138</sup> Justin's appeal to the Spirit might have been as convincing an argument as he could muster. For one thing, Justin shows enormous respect for Scripture; unlike someone such as Marcion, Justin is convinced that the sacred writings of the Jews are inspired and meaningful for the setting of doctrine, even down to the individual words. Here Justin would have found no disagreement from his Jewish opponents, nor is it likely that they would have raised concerns about the Spirit being portrayed as speaking through Scripture.<sup>139</sup> As

136 Skarsaune, "Justin and His Bible," 62. Prior to Skarsaune, this parallel had been highlighted by Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 221–223. Rokéah (*Justin Martyr and the Jews*, 27) points out that R. Meir was a contemporary of Justin.

137 Rokéah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews*, 33: "No one disputes that some post-Biblical material of a halakhic or exegetical-aggadica nature, with parallels in the Talmudic literature, must have come to Justin's attention. Hellenistic Jews like Trypho, with whom Justin came into contact, could serve as a conduit for such information, as could Christian propagandist literature." See Rokéah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews*, 33–42, for specific examples and conclusions, as well as the earlier works of Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 44–52; Shotwell, *Biblical Exegesis*, 71–90.

138 "In the entire *Dialogue* there is hardly any argument more offensive to a Jew than the argument concerning the Second God in *Dial.* 56–60" (Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 210).

139 Erik Sjöberg, "πνεῦμα καὶ ἁγία ῥῆσις: *Rûach* in Palestinian Judaism," *TDNT* 6:375–389; cf. Anthony

noted earlier, the citation of Scripture served for Jews and Christians alike as an important instance of the *topos* of divine testimony. Thus, just as the Jewish writers of the New Testament cited Scripture to advance their claim that Jesus was the promised Messiah, so also Justin's appeal to Scripture and the Spirit who inspired it seems like a logical means of attempting to win over his Jewish interlocutors to accepting Christ as the fulfillment of Judaism.

The problem with this evangelistic view, however, is that it assumes that Justin's writings were intended to persuade Jews to convert to Christianity. As Boyarin has demonstrated, however, Justin's primary purpose was likely to fashion a Christian theological self-identity that was distinct from Judaism as he constructed it.<sup>140</sup> In this case, Justin's appeal to the Spirit makes a great deal of sense when we remember that it was this same Spirit who played such a large role in the worship and life of his Christian community. According to Justin, Christians are marked by their possession of the Spirit and its giftings,<sup>141</sup> and we should not therefore underestimate the importance of Justin's appeal to this same Spirit as the source of the testimony to the very set of beliefs (namely, Jesus as Lord and God) that would come to set Christians apart from Jews.

We have seen, then, that Justin's appeal to the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit can be plausibly explained by the context of Justin's engagement with Judaism and his efforts to construct a distinctive Christian identity. What, though, of the other contexts in which Justin's argument can be read? In particular, scholars have pointed to elements of Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56 that seem better suited as part of an anti-Marcionite polemic than as part of his engagement with Judaism. As Skarsaune points out, Justin's appeal to the Old Testament theophanies seems to go beyond what the debate with Judaism concerning a "second God" would seem to require or find useful.<sup>142</sup> After all, Justin

---

C. Thiselton, *The Holy Spirit—In Biblical Teaching, through the Centuries, and Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 27; Segal, "Two Powers in Heaven," 79. On the common ground that Justin shares with his Jewish opponents, see Allert, *Revelation*, 78–98, though no mention is made of the significance of the Spirit's testimony.

140 Justin's central argument was "not so much to convince the Jews to accept the Logos, but rather to *deny* the Logos to the Jews," and therefore establish a distinct religious identity for the followers of Christ separate from that of the Jews (Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 38).

141 Cf. *Dial.* 88.1 (PTS 47:222); Thiselton, *Holy Spirit*, 169.

142 As Skarsaune (*Proof from Prophecy*, 210–211) points out, the issue of contention between Jews and Christians at this time was the question of if there was a "second God," and Justin need not have gone beyond quoting the key "two powers" texts. Cf. Segal, "Two Powers in Heaven," 75–84; on *Dial.* 56, "It is significant that the angelic figure is accepted by the Jew, only his messianic status is questioned" (Segal, "Two Powers in Heaven," 86).

and Trypho appear to go out of their way to declare their unity on the specific confession that there is no God above that which made the universe.<sup>143</sup> This brings us to consider the extent to which the conflict with Marcion may provide explanatory power for understanding Justin's decision to link the Spirit with Trinitarian testimony.

### *Justin and Marcion*

Scholars have long detected aspects of Justin's *Dial.* that appear to be directed at Marcion and his followers.<sup>144</sup> This should not be surprising in light of the fact that Justin and Marcion were in Rome at the same time and that Marcion had, at the time of Justin's arrival, already succeeded in organizing his own churches in Rome.<sup>145</sup> As in the above case of Judaism, we must recognize that with respect to his anti-Marcionite discourse Justin is likely not reporting objective facts concerning Marcion and his theology, but is engaging with Marcion

143 *Dial.* 56.4, 16 (PTS 47:161, 165). As Skarsaune (*Proof from Prophecy*, 210) concludes, in this particular passage "it seems as if Justin is eager to make Trypho his theological and exegetical ally against an un-named opponent: Marcion!"

144 See, e.g., Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, 20–32; Charles H. Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr and the Emerging New Testament Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho," *VC* 36 (1982): 218–219; Sebastian Moll, "Justin and the Pontic Wolf," in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 145–151.

145 For background on the life of Marcion and the spread of the Marcionite church, see E.C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: SPCK, 1948), 1–14. Justin mentions Marcion and his followers by name at *1 Apol.* 26.5, 58.1 (SC 507:200, 281); *Dial.* 35.6 (PTS 47:129). Regarding Marcion's chronology, the traditional view, following patristic sources, is that Marcion arrived in Rome ca. 140 C.E., was expelled from the community of the orthodox Roman churches and founded his own in July of 144, and died around 160; see further Peter Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, ed. Marshall D. Johnson, trans. Michael Steinhauser (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 241–256, who follows the work of Adolf Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921). R. Joseph Hoffmann, *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century*, AARAS 46 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984), 74, presents an alternative chronology that is far more skeptical of the early sources, suggesting that Marcion was active in Asia Minor ca. 110–150 C.E. and that his purported trip to Rome was a patristic fiction. Hoffmann's work has not been well-received; cf. the criticisms of Sebastian Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, WUNT 250 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 7–8. In the most recent work on Marcion, Lieu (*Marcion*, 297) accepts "the most stable tradition that associates Marcion with Rome." A vigorous defense of the traditional chronology and Marcion's activity in Rome may be found in Moll, *Arch-Heretic Marcion*, 25–46.

and his ideas in service of the larger project of constructing a Christian identity that is distinct from that of those groups he believes to be heretical.<sup>146</sup>

Returning again to Justin's interpretation of Gen 18–19 in *Dial.* 56, we indeed find traces of anti-Marcionite polemic. As noted above, despite the *prima facie* obviousness of anti-Jewish polemic as the basis for Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56–60, some scholars nevertheless suspect that Justin's real opponent in these chapters is, in fact, none other than Marcion.<sup>147</sup> It is, after all, precisely those arguments that do not appear to be necessary in the immediate context of the argument with Judaism that most suggest anti-Marcionite sentiments. For instance, the fact that Justin and Trypho agree that there is no God above "the Maker of all things" (τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων) seems expressly designed to counter a view, like Marcion's, which subordinates a creative demiurge to the one true God.<sup>148</sup>

Marcion would have agreed with Justin, against the rabbis, that there were two gods, but he would have found problematic the identification of the subject of the Old Testament theophanies as Jesus. For Marcion, it is only with the advent of Jesus that the one true God is made known; the Old Testament does not reveal or prophesy about Christ or about this true God. Thus, Marcion would have agreed with the rabbis that the Old Testament only speaks of one god; their only difference would have been with respect to the nature of this god. Justin, then, is forced to defend his "two powers" claims against both the rabbis and the Marcionites.<sup>149</sup>

Justin's response to Marcion in *Dial.* 56 appears designed to engage Marcionite exegesis on its own terms. For Marcion, part of rejecting the Old Testament as a means of pointing to Christ meant rejecting the allegorizing reading of the Hebrew Bible so popular among his contemporaries (Justin, of course, included).<sup>150</sup> Justin, though, is particularly concerned here to pay careful atten-

146 On Justin's construction of Marcion as a heretic, see Lieu, *Marcion*, 15–25.

147 See, e.g., Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, 25. Skarsaune (*Proof from Prophecy*, 211) suggests that this section may be reproduced from Justin's non-extant *Syntagma*, but note the criticism of Lieu (*Marcion*, 24), who finds this approach "over-simplistic."

148 *Dial.* 56.4 (PTS 47:161). Indeed, Trypho never accuses Justin of claiming belief in a deity higher than the creator god, and certainly there is no reason to suspect that Trypho would think so; cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 210.

149 On this point, see further Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 234–243. In other words, whereas the rabbis rejected the "two powers" tradition altogether, and Marcion interpreted the "two powers" dualistically, Justin interprets the "two powers" in a binitarian sense.

150 Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence*, 115, as well as 114–117 on Marcion's hermeneutic more broadly. This forms the basis of Tertullian's critique in book 3 of his *Marc.*

tion to the literal wording and grammatical structure of Gen 19:24 in such a way that, presumably, he believed Marcion would find believable, even enlisting Trypho's support in making his case.<sup>151</sup> Thus, Justin endeavors to show, against Marcion, that the Old Testament theophanies, including Gen 19:24, have none other than Jesus as their subject. In this way, he demonstrates that the Old Testament does indeed speak of Christ and relates him to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—precisely the opposite of what Marcion was claiming.<sup>152</sup> Indeed, whereas Justin in other portions of *Dial.* might appeal to an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, here he instead utilizes a literal reading of the text alongside prosopological exegesis, a reading strategy that we saw above was grounded in the most elementary steps of formal literary analysis. Thus, we might say that Justin seeks to engage Marcion on the particular details of the biblical text rather than appealing to an allegorical reading that points away from the text itself.<sup>153</sup>

Again, though, we must ask what role the link between the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony might have played in this specific context, and the answer is not so clear. While Marcion likely believed in the Holy Spirit, he appears to have been “almost wholly silent” concerning the Spirit in his writings and teaching.<sup>154</sup> Given, then, that pneumatology seems to have played such a minor role in Marcion's theology, it is unlikely that Justin developed this particular argument with Marcion in mind. Thus, though elements of *Dial.* 56 are undoubtedly targeted at Marcion and his followers, the specific aspect of its argument linking the Spirit with Trinitarian testimony seems to fit much better in the context of the process of Christian self-definition with respect to Judaism.

---

151 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 210. Here we must recall that though we may be tempted to think that any argument appealing to the Old Testament would have had no value for Marcion and his disciples, Marcion did indeed believe that the Old Testament had some degree of value insofar as it testified to the historical record of events; cf. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence*, 113–114.

152 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 210–211.

153 As Lieu (*Marcion*, 24) observes with respect to Marcion, Justin “may also have been rightly alert to the most crucial, and hence, potentially vulnerable points in his attempt to forge a Christian reading of the Scriptures within the intellectual world of his time.”

154 Swete, *Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 65. Still, the fact that Marcion's version of the Lord's Prayer appears to have begun with a supplication not to the Father but to the Spirit shows some interest in the Spirit; see further Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*, NTTSD 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 138–140.

### *Justin and Platonic Philosophy*

As a third point of contextual reference, we must consider the role of the Spirit in Justin's engagement with Middle Platonism.<sup>155</sup> As Justin himself informs us, his quest for truth ultimately led him to Platonism, by which he "expected immediately to gaze upon God, for this is the goal of Plato's philosophy."<sup>156</sup> When, however, Justin tells the old man with whom he speaks in *Dial.* 3–8 of Plato's belief that God is to be perceived by the mind alone (*Dial.* 3.7), the old man counters with the following challenge:

"Is there, then," he asked, "such and so great a power in our mind? Or does it not immediately perceive that which is received through the senses? Will the human mind see God at some time, if not adorned by the Holy Spirit?" [...] "What affinity," he asked, "do we then have with God? Is the soul also divine and immortal and a part of that royal mind itself? And as this [royal mind] sees God, are we in this way also able to comprehend the deity in our mind and hence to be happy now?"<sup>157</sup>

In these chapters, the old man challenges Justin's Platonic epistemology on the grounds that the human mind, because it is part of the created world, cannot therefore truly know the uncreated God. Drawing, ironically, on the Platonic principle that only like can know like, the old man puts forward the notion of the filling of the Holy Spirit as the only thing that empowers the mind to know God.<sup>158</sup> "For," the old man tells Justin, "no one is able to perceive or understand these [truths] unless God and his Christ give him understanding."<sup>159</sup> The filling

155 On Justin's relationship to philosophy in general and Middle Platonism in particular, see further Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 27–38; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 66–76; Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 272–284; Arthur J. Droge, "Justin Martyr and the Restoration of Philosophy," *CH* 56 (1987): 303–319; R.M. Price, "'Hellenization' and Logos Doctrine in Justin Martyr," *VC* 42 (1988): 18–23; M.J. Edwards, "On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr," *JTS* 42 (1991): 17–34; idem, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God," *JES* 3 (1995): 261–280.

156 *Dial.* 2.6 (PTS 47:73): ἡλπίζον αὐτίκα κατόψεσθαι τὸν θεόν· τοῦτο γὰρ τέλος τῆς Πλάτωνος φιλοσοφίας.

157 *Dial.* 4.1–2 (PTS 47:76–77): "Ἐστὶν οὖν, φησί, τῷ νῷ ἡμῶν τοιαύτη τις καὶ τοσαύτη δύναμις, ὡς ὁρᾶν ὃ μὴ τάχιον δι' αἰσθήσεως ἔλαβεν; Ἡ τὸν θεὸν ἀνθρώπου νοῦς ὀψεται ποτε μὴ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι κεκοσμημένος; [...] Τίς οὖν ἡμῖν, ἔλεγε, συγγένεια πρὸς τὸν θεόν ἐστίν; Ἡ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ θεία καὶ ἀθάνατός ἐστι καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐκείνου τοῦ βασιλικοῦ νοῦ μέρος; Ὡς δὲ ἐκεῖνος ὁρᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὕτω καὶ ἡμῖν ἐφικτὸν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ νῷ συλλαβεῖν τὸ θεῖον καὶ τούντεῦθεν ἡδὴ εὐδαιμονεῖν;

158 Allert, *Revelation*, 152; cf. Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 68–69.

159 *Dial.* 7.3 (PTS 47:84): οὐ γὰρ συνοπτὰ ταῦτα οὐδὲ συννοητὰ πᾶσιν ἐστίν, εἰ μὴ τῷ θεὸς δῶ συνιέναι καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ.

of the divine Spirit, then, is the only means by which one can know God; previously this filling was exemplified by the Hebrew prophets, who “spoke through the divine Spirit”<sup>160</sup> and whose writings now provide the basis for constructing a true view of God. In sum, this refutation of the Middle Platonic notion that God may be seen by the powers of the mind represents a radical shift in Justin’s epistemology that sets the foundation for the rest of Justin’s arguments in *Dial.*<sup>161</sup>

Still, one might rightly ask if, in this circumstance, Justin’s Christianity is taking philosophy captive or vice versa. After all, scholars have noted that Justin’s background as a philosopher played a major role in the incorporation of Greek philosophy into Christian doctrine.<sup>162</sup> In any event, as a result of this synthesis of Greek and Christian ideas the Spirit plays a central role in Justin’s theory of how human beings can come to know God. This understanding of the Spirit’s function is, of course, not too dissimilar from that found in 1 Cor 2:10–12, which we will consider as a possible influence on Justin in the next section. Regardless, though, of whether Justin derived this idea from Plato or from Paul (or from some mixture of the two), the insight that the Spirit is the only means by which the human mind can know God helps explain why the Spirit is the ideal source of Trinitarian testimony.

It is also possible that Justin is engaging not so much with Platonism directly as he is with the Platonism that was mediated through the Gnosticism of his day. The Gnostics, as some scholars have argued, in essence took the development of the “two powers” traditions, so central to Justin’s argument in *Dial.* 56, in a dualistic rather than binitarian direction.<sup>163</sup> Drawing on elements of a Platonic worldview, the Gnostics distinguished between a lesser creator god (as well as other heavenly beings) and the one true god, of which the former was ignorant. Over the course of his work, Justin does make reference to some of the leading Gnostics<sup>164</sup> and appears at times to argue against certain characteristically Gnostic beliefs.<sup>165</sup> Clearly, in addition to the Jews and Marcion, the Gnostics are an important opponent for Justin, but we must ask whether our key passage, *Dial.* 56.14–15, has the last of these in mind.<sup>166</sup> On the one hand, we

160 *Dial.* 7.1 (PTS 47:83): θεῖω πνεύματι λαλήσαντες.

161 Allert, *Revelation*, 153–155.

162 Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus*, 283.

163 See further Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 244–259.

164 See, for instance, his reference to the Valentinians and Basilidians at *Dial.* 35.6 (PTS 47:129).

165 For instance, in *Dial.* 80–82 (PTS 47:208–213), Justin appears to attack a Gnostic understanding of the resurrection; cf. Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, 20–22.

166 Following a majority of scholars (see, for instance, Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, 25), I con-



could plausibly read Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56.14–15 as designed to counter the Gnostics' dualistic reading of the "two powers" passages. On the other, different elements of the argument in *Dial.* 56 are, as we saw above, tailor-made for engaging with Marcion, but do not serve to refute any other characteristically Gnostic beliefs. As such, we will defer a more thorough analysis of the Gnostics and their view of the Spirit to the next chapter of this book, where we will take up the subject of Irenaeus, whose writings represent the height of anti-Gnostic polemic.

In conclusion, I find it unhelpful to limit the possible historical-theological influences on *Dial.* 56, much less *Dial.* 56.14–15 more specifically, to any one of the above three contexts to the exclusion of the other two. Justin has shown himself to be a subtle enough writer that we can easily imagine him engaging with each of these groups at the same time; even if he intended to direct his polemic at just one of these groups, we lack the means to reach such a conclusion from the text as we have it. Still, when we consider the more specific aspect of Justin's argument in which he links the Spirit with the provision of testimony to the deity or lordship of the Father and the Son, we have found that this particular innovation is most plausibly explained by his engagement with Judaism and his efforts to construct an identity that is distinctively Christian. This innovation was likely further supported, if not originally motivated, by the epistemological shift recounted in *Dial.* 3–8. In the next section, we will consider how Justin drew from writings that were distinctively Christian—that is, the writings that would come to form the New Testament—in order to craft this influential view of the Spirit and its Trinitarian testimony.

### The New Testament Roots of Justin's Exegesis

Now that we have situated Justin's pneumatological innovation in its historical and theological contexts, demonstrating *why* he chose to have the Spirit testify to the divinity and lordship of the Father and the Son, we can turn to the related question of *what* New Testament ideas Justin may have used in order to make this particular theological move. Attempting to answer this question, however, generates the methodological difficulty of selecting which New Testament texts to analyze as possible influences on Justin. The further methodological problem of setting criteria by which to gauge the influence of one text or author

---

sider Marcion's views to be distinct from the views generally categorized as "Gnostic." This, however, gets at the problems with the label "Gnostic," for which see the next chapter.

on another has already been briefly treated in the introduction of this book, so we can proceed directly to the problem of identifying passages of interest. Broadly speaking, I have approached this problem on the basis of searching the New Testament for specific lexical and conceptual parallels to particular aspects of Justin's innovative reading of the Old Testament that links the Spirit with testimony to the other persons of the Godhead. As we will see, no single New Testament text contains all of the raw materials needed to develop this particular view of the Spirit; rather, it is only when Justin draws these different elements together into a coherent whole do we find the account of the Spirit's testifying work that we have analyzed above. Thus, at the outset of this section, I will set forth what I believe to be the essential components of Justin's understanding of the Spirit with respect to Trinitarian testimony; this is, in effect, a summary of what we have discovered earlier in this chapter. These essential elements are as follows:

- (1) *The Spirit as primary speaking agent.* We have seen that Justin conceived of the Spirit not just as the inspiring secondary agent behind the words of Scripture but also, at times, as a primary speaking agent in its own right. Thus, we are interested in New Testament passages in which the Spirit speaks directly, as from its own person, especially when the Spirit does so through the words of the Old Testament.
- (2) *The Spirit as provider of authoritative, reliable testimony.* Implicit in Justin's argument is his belief that the Spirit's testimony is true. As such, we are interested in New Testament passages that link the Spirit with truth or portray the Spirit as a particularly reliable, authoritative witness.
- (3) *The Spirit as provider of testimony concerning other divine persons.* As observed above, Justin portrays the Spirit as testifying concerning the lordship and divinity of the Father and/or the Son, calling them "Lord" and "God." Accordingly, we are interested in New Testament passages in which the Spirit provides testimony that has a member of the Godhead as the *subject* of its testimony.
- (4) *The Spirit as provider of testimony to other divine persons.* Finally, Justin at times further portrays the Spirit as testifying not just *about* the Father and the Son but as testifying *to* them concerning one another. As such, we are interested in New Testament passages that have a member of the Godhead as the *recipient* of the Spirit's testimony.

A close reading of the New Testament has revealed three sets of texts, first from the Johannine corpus, then from Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, and finally from the Letter to the Hebrews, that each contain at least one of these

elements, as will be demonstrated below. As we will see, each of these theological raw materials will be found at some point in the New Testament, but they will never appear, as they will in Justin, all together in one place.

### *The Influence of Johannine Pneumatology*

The first pair of texts we will analyze, on account of their appearing to contain some of the essential elements of Justin's understanding of the Spirit with respect to Trinitarian testimony, are from the Johannine writings.<sup>167</sup> These texts, which we will examine in turn as possible influences on Justin, are John 15:26–27 and 1 John 5:6–9.

We begin with John 15:26–27, which we must first briefly set in its larger literary and theological context. These verses fall within the broader literary unit of Jesus's so-called "Farewell Discourse" (John 13:31–16:33), in which Jesus prepares his disciples for his imminent departure from this world.<sup>168</sup> In these chapters, Jesus introduces the figure of the Paraclete (ὁ παράκλητος), who is identified as the Holy Spirit and the one who will be sent by the Father to teach the disciples in Jesus's absence.<sup>169</sup> Among the Farewell Discourse's five Paraclete passages,<sup>170</sup> we are most interested in 15:26–27, for it is only in these verses that the Spirit is explicitly linked with the notion of testimony, a char-

167 An analysis of the subject of Johannine pneumatology in general is beyond the scope of this project, but see C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), 213–227; George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, SNTSMS 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970); Felix Porsch, *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974); Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987); John Breck, *Spirit of Truth: The Origins of Johannine Pneumatology*, vol. 1 of *Spirit of Truth: The Holy Spirit in Johannine Tradition* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991); Tricia Gates Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-scientific Perspective*, JSNTSup 253 (London: T&T Clark, 2003). For a concise summary, see Thiselton, *Holy Spirit*, 131–147.

168 On the Farewell Discourse, see further Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John XIII–XXI*, AB 29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970), 581–603; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 vols. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 2:893–898; L. Scott Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13.31–16.33*, JSNTSup 256 (London: T&T Clark, 2004); Marianne Meye Thompson, *John: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015), 295–346.

169 On the Paraclete, see further Eduard Schweizer, "πνεῦμα κατ' ε IV: New Testament," *TDNT* 6:437–444; Brown, *John XIII–XXI*, 1135–1143; Keener, *John*, 2:953–966; Thompson, *John*, 318–322.

170 These are John 14:15–17, 14:26, 15:26–27, 16:7–11, and 16:12–14.

acteristically important role in Justin's pneumatology. It is at this point that we must also set the theological context of these verses by noting that, in the Fourth Gospel, the author makes frequent use of what has been termed a "trial motif."<sup>171</sup> Not only is Jesus on trial before his contemporaries, but the world is on trial before God, with Jesus cast as the witness providing the most important testimony (cf. 18:37).<sup>172</sup> This motif is extended with respect to the Paraclete, then, when in these verses the Johannine Jesus, in light of his imminent return to the Father, tells his disciples, "When the Advocate (ὁ παράκλητος) comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth (ἀληθείας) who comes from the Father, he will testify (μαρτυρήσει) on my behalf. You also are to testify because you have been with me from the beginning" (15:26–27).<sup>173</sup>

There are several things worth pointing out about this text. First, the theme of testimony has been extended beyond the time of Jesus's earthly ministry into the church age; the Paraclete functions as the advocate who will continue the trial even as the church experiences the world's persecution.<sup>174</sup> Second, the Paraclete's witness to the world is in fact an extension of Jesus's witness.

- 
- 171 On the extensive history of scholarship concerning the Fourth Gospel's trial motif (*Prozessmotiv*), see Burge, *Anointed Community*, 36–38, and bibliography cited therein. The most recent work on this topic is Per Jarle Bekken, *The Lawsuit Motif in John's Gospel from New Perspectives: Jesus Christ, Crucified Criminal and Emperor of the World*, NovTSup 158 (Leiden: Brill, 2015).
- 172 See further A.E. Harvey, *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1976); Burge, *Anointed Community*, 204–221. On the key word μαρτυρέω and its cognates, see Hermann Strathmann, "μάρτυς κτλ," *TDNT* 4:474–514, and esp. 4:495–496 on the Johannine writings.
- 173 John 15:26–27 (NA28:355; trans. NRSV): "Ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ· καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε, ὅτι ἂπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστέ. The word παράκλητος could also reasonably be translated as "helper," "mediator," or "sponsor."
- 174 For scholarship emphasizing this juridical understanding of the Paraclete's work, see Burge, *Anointed Community*, 141; Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel according to Saint John*, BNTC (London: Continuum, 2005), 393–395, 411–412. Beyond this legal sense of the term "Paraclete," there was also in the ancient world an understanding of a "Paraclete" as a figure who could mediate to powerful people. Brown (*Spirit in the Writings of John*, 196) has helpfully developed this understanding of the term with respect to ancient patron-client relationships and brokerage networks, suggesting that, in this instance, the Paraclete is a "subordinate broker" who makes Jesus's patronage available to many following Jesus's departure; cf. Keener, *John*, 2:1023. Interestingly, this understanding of the Spirit as advocate finds little parallel in Judaism; so Sjöberg, *TDNT* 6:388. Though I am here highlighting the potential legal function of the term "Paraclete," I do not see this as in any way opposed to the broader understanding that Brown has illuminated.

Whereas the disciples will testify *about* Jesus (15:27), the Spirit testifies *for* Jesus (cf. 16:12–13).<sup>175</sup> In particular, this testimony appears to center upon providing human beings with a correct understanding of Jesus's person and work.<sup>176</sup> Third, the Spirit's testimony is true; indeed, the Paraclete is here called the "Spirit of truth."<sup>177</sup> The truth of the Spirit's testimony is, no doubt, guaranteed by the Spirit's unity with Jesus, who is himself "the truth" (14:6).<sup>178</sup> Fourth, this passage has in view both the Father and the Son; we have already seen that the Spirit bears witness to the Son, but the text also notes that the Spirit is "sent from" or "proceeds from" the Father.<sup>179</sup> As in our key texts in Justin, all three persons of what will come to be identified as the Trinity are in view in this passage.

In sum, therefore, in John 15:26–27 (and in its broader setting in the Farewell Discourse), the Spirit's role is explicitly cast as an advocate for the church who testifies concerning the Son; in fact, it is only in John 15:26–27 that we find a New Testament writer linking the Spirit with the verb μαρτυρέω used in reference to another divine person. While this characterization appears to be limited to the church age,<sup>180</sup> and the testimony appears to be directed at humankind, as opposed to other divine persons, we may nevertheless see in this verse a biblical basis for Justin's later developments concerning the Spirit and intra-divine

175 Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John*, 215–216; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 213; Keener, *John*, 2:1022–1024.

176 Cf. Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John*, 200; Breck, *Spirit of Truth*, 164. This is, as Keener (*John*, 2:1113) points out, merely an extension of what is often implicit in the Hebrew understanding of truth, insofar as it often is used to speak of "God's faithfulness to His covenant of redemption."

177 On non-biblical backgrounds for the term "Spirit of Truth," see Breck, *Spirit of Truth*, 53–68, 125–145. The title "Spirit of Truth," in its Johannine context, fits within a broader framework of Johannine dualism; cf. Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John*, 199; Keener, *John*, 2:969–971.

178 On the "functional unity" of Jesus and the Paraclete, see Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John*, 189–192; cf. Burge, *Anointed Community*, 87–95, on the Fourth Gospel's "Spirit Christology" and the intimate union of Jesus and the Spirit.

179 "This language suggests Jesus brokers the Spirit-Paraclete to believers, though ultimately it constitutes a benefit from the Father" (Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John*, 208).

180 Interestingly, the verb tense of μαρτυρήσει is future, with no indication that the Spirit's role of testifying to the Son occurred prior to the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus, as is presupposed by Justin and later writers. Indeed, this focus on the *future* testimony of the Spirit (as also seen in, e.g., 16:12–13) opened the door to future, supplementary revelations from the Spirit; on some scholarly reconstructions, this led to a schism in the Johannine community and the so-called "Johannine adjustment" in 1John (see further Burge, *Anointed Community*, 214–220).

testimony. If, as we saw above, Justin's appeal to the Spirit was rooted in his community's experience of the Spirit in its life and worship, we can understand how he may have taken what they already knew of the Spirit—namely, that it testifies concerning the Son—and extended it into their reading of the Old Testament.

Staying within the Johannine corpus, we turn next to 1John 5:6–9.<sup>181</sup> In the context of one of the final units of the epistle, John points out the power of faith and discusses the role of testimony with respect to that faith (5:4b–12).<sup>182</sup> Having argued that the person who conquers the world is the one who believes that Jesus is the Son of God (5:4b–5), John makes the following argument concerning the role of testimony at 5:6–9:

This is the one who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ, not with the water only but with the water and the blood. And the Spirit is the one that testifies (τὸ μαρτυροῦν), for the Spirit is the truth (ἀλήθεια). There are three that testify: the Spirit and the water and the blood, and these three agree. If we receive human testimony, the testimony of God is greater (ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων ἐστίν); for this is the testimony of God that he has testified to his Son.<sup>183</sup>

We may first note how this passage carries over much of the same language as the Johannine Farewell Discourse; the Spirit is again linked with both μαρτυρία and ἀλήθεια, thus carrying on the Fourth Gospel's testimony motif.<sup>184</sup> Further-

181 The dominant scholarly consensus, which I will follow, holds that the Gospel of John was written before the Johannine epistles, but there is a minority position in favor of the priority of the epistles; see, e.g., Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (New York: Crossroad, 1992).

182 On this section, see further Raymond E. Brown, *The Epistles of John*, AB 30 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982), 569–603.

183 1John 5:6–9 (NA28:724–725; trans. NRSV): οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι· καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια. ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἶμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν. εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνομεν, ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων ἐστίν· ὅτι αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

184 I understand the present active participle μαρτυροῦν in 5:6 to be functioning substantively, most likely in a gnomic sense; thus, if John 15:26–27 only focused on the future testifying of the Spirit, 1John 5:6 allows for an understanding of this role as a present reality. Cf. Judith M. Lieu, *I, II, and III John: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 213–214.

more, the Spirit is again testifying concerning the Son, namely his baptism and death (“the water and the blood”),<sup>185</sup> though no explanation is given for precisely *how* the Spirit goes about this work of testifying.<sup>186</sup> Crucially for our purposes, however, this passage goes further in its discussion of the trial motif in light of a key theological reflection: God’s testimony is “greater” (μείζων) than that of any human being in terms of its reliability, which is, after all, precisely what makes the *topos* of divine testimony so persuasive. This testimony, the passage indicates, is from the Father concerning the Son, and is provided by means of the Spirit, along with the water and the blood.<sup>187</sup> Thus, though the “greater” testimony of God involves not the Spirit but the Father testifying to the Son and his resulting provision of salvation, the author’s emphasis on the importance of *divine* testimony to the Son is a striking theological insight, albeit one that is perfectly intelligible within ancient rhetorical practice. Even assuming the author of the epistle does not believe the Spirit to be God,<sup>188</sup> this claim’s close proximity to a reference to the Spirit as the testifier *par excellence* suggests that it would not be very difficult for later Christians such as Justin to connect this need for divine testimony concerning the Son with the Spirit’s testifying role, particularly in light of developing Trinitarian theology.<sup>189</sup> Taking what we have found in these Johannine texts, therefore, we can compare their key insights with the aforementioned four essential components of Justin’s approach in Table 4 on the following page.

---

185 On the variety of possible referents for this phrase, see Lieu, *I, II, and III John*, 208–213. The Spirit’s presence at Jesus’s baptism (John 1:32–33) and death (19:30) appears to reflect a common tradition; in the latter event, the conjunction of the Spirit (19:30) with blood and water (19:34–35) seems to be the basis for the claim that these three “agree” (1John 5:8). Cf. Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John*, 251–253; Burge, *Anointed Community*, 95–96.

186 Brown (*Spirit in the Writings of John*, 251–254) notes that the text does not provide any discussion of how the Spirit goes about testifying; for her part, Brown suspects that the focus is on the community’s possession of the Spirit.

187 Lieu, *I, II, and III John*, 216.

188 Lieu (*I, II, and III John*, 215) points out that the Spirit is here included in the same category as water and blood, but not alongside the mention of the Father and Son in 1John 5:9–12.

189 A point reinforced by the later addition of the so-called *Comma Johanneum*, which added a reference to the Father, Word, and Holy Spirit as three witnesses “in heaven” in contrast to the three witnesses “on earth.” Cf. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 647–649. This is, of course, hardly the most prominent interpolation in the Johannine corpus; cf. Kyle R. Hughes, “The Lukan Special Material and the Tradition History of the Pericope Adulterae,” *NovT* 55 (2013): 232–251.

TABLE 4 *Elements of Justin's innovative pneumatology in the Johannine writings*

Passage	Primary speaker	True testimony	Subject: God	Recipient: God
John 15:26–27		×	×	
1 John 5:6–9		×	×	

Returning to the analytical criteria set out in the introduction of this book, the case for these Johannine passages as an influence on Justin is strong. While the evidence for the more narrow category of volume is weak (we do not, for instance, find the words θεολογέω and κυριολογέω used in either of these passages), the evidence for thematic coherence is very solid, with John closely linking the Spirit to the concept of testimony concerning another divine person. Perhaps the strongest objection to suggesting Johannine influence on Justin concerns the question of availability. However, the arguments for the claim that the Johannine writings could not have been known in Rome in the middle of the second century have been dismantled by Charles Hill, who has authoritatively demonstrated that John's Gospel was among the "Memoirs" that Justin had at his disposal; in fact, there is a surprising amount of evidence for the use of the Fourth Gospel in the first half of the second century, including in Rome around the time of Justin.<sup>190</sup>

190 Charles E. Hill, "Was John's Gospel among Justin's *Apostolic Memoirs*?" in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 88–94; cf. idem, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Skarsaune, "Justin and His Bible," 67–68. Following much recent scholarship, I take the "Memoirs" to be synonymous with the "Gospels" to which Justin often makes reference, with both terms referring to written manuscripts of at least some of the canonical Gospels; so Allert, *Revelation*, 15, 188–193; Skarsaune, "Justin and His Bible," 66–74; Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 56–58, 151–152. For a dissenting view, see Cosgrove, "New Testament Canon," 209–232, but note the criticisms of Allert (*Revelation*, 15–25) and Charles E. Hill, "Justin and the New Testament Writings," *StPatr* 30 (1997): 42–48. Most recently, see the collection of essays in Tuomas Rasimus, ed., *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*, NovTSup 132 (Leiden: Brill, 2010). It is also conceivable that these Johannine ideas circulated in oral traditions apart from the written text and that Justin was influenced by them in this manner; cf. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett, "Reflections on Method: What Constitutes the Use of the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers?" in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 78.



With this objection having been dealt with, there is good reason to suspect that the Johannine writings influenced Justin by forging the key link between the Spirit and testimony, at least as understood in a broad sense. In fact, this claim of influence has high explanatory power; the notion that God's testimony is greater than that of any human being would have been particularly important for Justin, who did in fact understand the Spirit to be God. However, as the chart above indicates, the Johannine passages do not portray the Spirit as functioning as a primary speaking agent with respect to dialogical passages in the Old Testament, nor do they portray God as the recipient of this testimony, and so we will have to examine other biblical material in search of possible inspiration for these particular ideas.

### *The Influence of Pauline Pneumatology*

For our next set of quotations, we turn to Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians. Just as with the Johannine writings, the general subject of Pauline pneumatology is well beyond the scope of this study;<sup>191</sup> here we will limit our attention to two key verses that may have provided Justin with some of the theological raw materials for linking the Spirit with intra-divine testimony in light of the search criteria set out at the beginning of this section: 1 Cor 12:3 and 2:10–12.

We begin with 1 Cor 12:3 because it is upon this verse, Briggman suggests, that Justin develops his understanding of the Spirit's role in testifying to the divinity of the Father and the Son.<sup>192</sup> In this portion of the epistle (1 Cor 12–14), Paul turns to the contentious issue of spiritual gifts, likely one of the troubling matters about which the Corinthians had written him.<sup>193</sup> At the outset of this unit, having expressed his desire for the Corinthians to be properly informed on the subject (12:1) and having reminded them of their past lives of idolatry (12:2), Paul makes the following statement (12:3): "Therefore I want you to understand

191 For a summary of Pauline pneumatology, see Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994); Finny Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology: The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Judaism and in the Early Development of Paul's Theology*, WUNT 2/194 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Thiselton, *Holy Spirit*, 70–94.

192 Briggman, "Justin's Approach," 113 n. 20.

193 That this is a unit is suggested by the use of the formula *περί δέ* in 12:1, which links it back to the first instance of this formula in 7:1: *περί δέ ὧν ἐγράψατε*. For an overview of the structure and content of this portion of the epistle, see Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, SP 7 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 441–443; Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*, HUT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 266–270.

that no one speaking by the Spirit of God ever says, ‘Let Jesus be cursed!’ and no one can say ‘Jesus is Lord’ except by the Holy Spirit.”<sup>194</sup> In its original setting, this text makes the point that a true recipient of the Spirit is one who confesses that Jesus is Lord.<sup>195</sup> As is so characteristic of this letter, Paul is concerned to promote a spiritual egalitarianism on the basis of shared participation in the Spirit, the one who enables every believer to confess Christ as Lord.<sup>196</sup> Indeed, it is only “in the Holy Spirit” (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ) that one can make this confession, such that it is the Spirit, and not the individual believer, who is truly speaking.<sup>197</sup>

Briggman is thus correct to point to this as a verse in which the Spirit is identified as the means by which Jesus’s true nature is revealed.<sup>198</sup> Of the four essential elements of Justin’s pneumatological innovation, however, it is only this emphasis on the Spirit providing testimony to God that is in view here. Indeed, there is some thematic coherence insofar as the Spirit is linked with the action of calling Jesus “Lord,” but because the passage exclusively focuses on the Spirit’s enabling of Christians to correctly confess the person and work of Christ, the notions of dialogue among divine persons or of the Spirit speaking through the Old Testament, so essential in Justin’s presentation of the Spirit’s testifying work, are noticeably absent from this text. Combined with the absence of any evidence of volume, the case for 1 Cor 12:3 as an influence on this aspect of Justin’s pneumatology is, therefore, not strong.

Perhaps a better passage within the Pauline corpus is another text from this same letter. In 1 Cor 2:6–16, Paul returns to the theme of the wisdom of God, a subject he had already introduced in 1 Cor 1:18–31.<sup>199</sup> Specifically, Paul contrasts

194 1 Cor 12:3 (NA28:541; trans. NRSV): διὸ γνωρίζω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλῶν λέγει· Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς, καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν· Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

195 Collins, *First Corinthians*, 445. For more on the possible *Sitz im Leben* of these verses, see Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 256.

196 Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 267–268: “In 12:3 Paul relativizes all claims to greater or lesser spiritual attainment because of ecstatic gifts by saying that every Christian is indeed a spiritual person because every Christian who makes the common acclamation Κύριος Ἰησοῦς (cf. 8:6) shows that she or he is possessed by the holy spirit.”

197 C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC (London: Black, 1968), 281. On the issue of “cursing Jesus,” with which we need not detain ourselves here, see Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 579–581.

198 Fee, *First Corinthians*, 582.

199 On the structure and content of this portion of the epistle, see Collins, *First Corinthians*, 121–139; Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 210–213; Peter Stuhlmacher, “The Hermeneu-

this divine wisdom with the wisdom of this world (2:6–9) before focusing in on the role of the Spirit in mediating God’s wisdom (2:10–14).<sup>200</sup> The key verses, for our purposes, come at 2:10–12:

These things God has revealed (ἀπεκάλυψεν) to us through the Spirit; for the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God. For what human being knows what is truly human except the human spirit that is within? So also no one comprehends what is truly God’s except the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit that is from God, so that we may understand the gifts bestowed on us by God.<sup>201</sup>

In summary, these verses argue that the wisdom of God is only available to those who possess God’s Spirit.<sup>202</sup> The key word in 2:10 is ἀπεκάλυψεν, a technical term referring to the “divine revelation of certain supernatural secrets”;<sup>203</sup> in context, Paul is arguing that God has “revealed” (ἀπεκάλυψεν) his wisdom “by the Spirit” (διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος).<sup>204</sup> The reason that the Spirit is the ideal agent for this revelation is made clear in 2:11, with Paul arguing that no one can know the things of God without having received the Spirit of God. In other words, as we saw previously with the Platonic principle of like knowing like, in Paul’s think-

---

tical Significance of 1 Cor 2:6–16,” in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 328–343.

200 For a summary of Paul’s argument in this section of the epistle, see further Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 121–129.

201 1 Cor 2:10–12 (NA28:521; trans. NRSV): ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος· τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐραυνᾷ, καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ. τίς γὰρ οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ; οὕτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν·

202 Fee, *First Corinthians*, 109.

203 Cf. BDAG, s.v. ἀποκαλύπτω. This is, of course, the language of apocalyptic dualism; cf. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 124–125. For an overview of the history of scholarship on the topic of Pauline apocalypticism, see R. Barry Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul’s Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*, JSNTSup 127 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

204 See further Markus Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990; repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 157–166; André Munzinger, *Discerning the Spirits: Theological and Ethical Hermeneutics in Paul*, SNTSMS 140 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 147, describes this as a “pneumatic epistemology.”

TABLE 5 *Elements of Justin's innovative pneumatology in 1 Corinthians*

Passage	Primary speaker	True testimony	Subject: God	Recipient: God
1 Cor 12:3			×	
1 Cor 2:10–12		×	×	

ing only the Spirit of God can comprehend the true reality of God.<sup>205</sup> Thus, in Paul's revelatory schema, the Spirit's role is to take what the Spirit alone knows about God and communicate it to believers (2:12).<sup>206</sup>

The significance of this passage for Justin's view of the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony is that, in light of Justin's aforementioned engagement with the Middle Platonism of his time, it provides biblical warrant for his appeal to the Spirit as the means by which God can be known. Justin thus has the support of the Christian Scriptures, not just the principles of Greco-Roman philosophy, for identifying the Spirit as the only figure who can reveal the deep mysteries of the Godhead. As such, even though there is little evidence for volume, there is a strong case for thematic coherence between Justin and Paul on this point; as it was Paul who emphasized that the Spirit is uniquely equipped to proclaim the Father and the Son to be Lord and God, Justin very well may have utilized this idea as one of the important biblical foundations for his pneumatological innovation. The parallels between Justin and these passages are summarized in Table 5 above.

Beyond the evidence of thematic coherence, how confident can we be of the hypothesis that Justin was influenced by these aspects of Paul's pneumatology? Again, the debate hinges on the question of availability. Because Justin never quotes Paul directly, scholars have questioned the extent to which Justin

205 Collins, *First Corinthians*, 133. As Fee (*First Corinthians*, 110) puts it, "The basis of this argument that follows is the Greek philosophic principle of 'like is known only by like,' that is, humans do not on their own possess the quality that would make it possible to know God or God's wisdom. Only 'like is known by like'; only God can know God. Therefore, the Spirit of God becomes the link of humanity, the 'quality' from God himself who makes the knowing possible."

206 Later Christian writers such as Basil of Caesarea explicitly took up this text in order to present the Spirit as the one who reveals divine mysteries, thereby defending the deity of the Spirit; cf. *Spir.* 18.46 (SC 17:195–197). See further Stephen M. Hildebrand, *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 185–187.

knew the Pauline writings.<sup>207</sup> Even if Justin had limited access to Paul's writings when he composed his own works, it seems likely that he had significant contact with Pauline ideas, especially those found in 1 Corinthians.<sup>208</sup> Indeed, Justin's frequent appeal to ideas present in 1 Corinthians supports the assumption that Justin had been influenced by these verses on account of the test of recurrence.<sup>209</sup> Thus, while these ideas present in 1 Corinthians are likely biblical influences on Justin's development of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, there is simply not enough specific volume to make any definitive claims.

### *The Influence of the Pneumatology of Hebrews*

We conclude this section with a look at one unique aspect of the pneumatology of the Letter to the Hebrews.<sup>210</sup> Interestingly, Hebrews is the only book of the New Testament in which the Spirit speaks the words of the Old Testament.<sup>211</sup> This phenomenon occurs most explicitly in two passages identified on account of our guiding criteria set out at the outset of this section: Heb 3:7–11 and 10:15–17.<sup>212</sup> We will examine each of these two passages in turn, finding that though

207 For an overview of the range of scholarly opinions on the nature of Justin's knowledge of Paul, see Paul Foster, "Justin and Paul," in *Paul and the Second Century*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson, LNTS 412 (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 108–125. Foster's more negative conclusion concerning the extent of Paul's influence on Justin may be contrasted with the more positive views of Skarsaune, "Justin and His Bible," 74; Rodney Werline, "The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*," *HTR* 92 (1999): 79–93. On the reception of the pneumatology of 1 Corinthians, see Anthony C. Thiselton, "The Holy Spirit in 1 Corinthians: Exegesis and Reception History in the Patristic Era," in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen Barton (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 207–228 (see esp. 216–219 on 1 Cor 2:11–12).

208 Again, it is entirely possible that Justin was influenced by Paul's ideas without direct literary dependence on the epistles themselves; cf. Gregory and Tuckett, "Reflections on Method," 80.

209 Skarsaune, "Justin and His Bible," 74–75; cf. Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 135–138.

210 For an overview of the pneumatology presented in Hebrews, see Thiselton, *Holy Spirit*, 153–156.

211 The best attempt to account for this phenomenon is Martin Emmrich, "Pneuma in Hebrews: Prophet and Interpreter," *WTJ* 63 (2002): 55–71. Emmrich argues that, like the Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament, the Spirit presents God's word directly to the people of God.

212 A potential third example is Heb 9:6–10, in which it is implied that the Spirit is speaking through the Old Testament as its ultimate interpreter, but there is no actual quotation. As for another potential example, Heb 1:14 is, like 2 Cor 3:14–17, a text that would become

their influence on Justin is more difficult to demonstrate, the pneumatological ideas contained therein provide an important supplement to those found in the Johannine corpus and 1 Corinthians.

In the case of Heb 3:7–11, the author of Hebrews is warning against unbelief in the context of his call to follow the suffering yet glorified Jesus.<sup>213</sup> The warning itself comes in the form of the Spirit “speaking” (λέγει) to the congregation the words of Ps 95:7–11, thus re-presenting God’s exhortation to ancient Israel for the audience of the epistle. While this passage is important as an instance in which the Spirit is speaking the words of the Old Testament, divine testimony and other divine persons are not in view, cautioning us against making too much of this as an influence on Justin. Besides this lack of thematic coherence, the fact that Justin does not quote Ps 95:7–11, here or elsewhere in his extant writings, speaks against there being any sort of volume. Thus, while the epistle’s appeal to the Old Testament as a source of God’s words concerning Christ and the church is much closer to Justin’s own use of the Old Testament, as opposed to that of his opponent Marcion, it is unlikely that this passage influenced Justin’s view of the Spirit’s testimony in any significant way.

Likewise, in the case of Heb 10:15–17, the author of Hebrews is making the case that Jesus’s sacrifice is the means by which, as the perfect high priest, the promised new covenant has been established. To make this claim, the author of Hebrews appeals to how the Spirit “testifies” (μαρτυρεῖ) the text of Jer 31:33–34 to his congregation.<sup>214</sup> This text is particularly interesting because the Spirit is not only again speaking through an Old Testament text, but is also associated with the verb μαρτυρέω. This calls to mind the link between the Spirit and testimony found in John 15:26–27, described above, and thus gives some evidence of thematic coherence. Still, this text does not involve testimony to or about God, nor does it indicate any more precise level of volume that would more clearly demonstrate influence.

Thus, Hebrews presents both similarities and differences with the key texts under consideration from Justin. For both Hebrews and Justin, the Spirit is

---

very important in later Christian reflection on the role of the Spirit and yet is never quoted or explicitly alluded to by Justin.

213 On Heb 3:7–11, see further Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 36 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 263–264; Luke Timothy Johnson, *Hebrews: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 112–118; Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 114–116.

214 On Heb 10:15–17, see further Koester, *Hebrews*, 441–442; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 254; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 281.

TABLE 6     *Elements of Justin's innovative pneumatology in Hebrews*

Passage	Primary speaker	True testimony	Subject: God	Recipient: God
Heb 3:7–11	×			
Heb 10:15–17	×	×		
Heb 1:8–9			×	×

speaking through the words of Scripture. The purposes of this speech, however, differ: in Hebrews, the Spirit exhorts a Christian audience to a certain way of life in light of their identity in Christ; in *Dial.* 56.14–15, the Spirit testifies to the divinity and lordship of the Father and the Son. The dialogical element of the Spirit’s speech in Hebrews could potentially move the Spirit in the direction of a primary speaking agent, but the dialogue involves human beings rather than other divine persons and is most likely simply an example of the Spirit’s secondary, inspiring function.

That being said, at least one scholar has gone further in suggesting that in Hebrews the Spirit does function as a primary speaking agent participating in intra-divine dialogue. Bates notes that Heb 1:8–9 cites Ps 45:6–7, and he suggests, in light of how Justin interprets this verse in *Dial.* 56, that the author of Hebrews “probably found the Spirit to be speaking via David in the Spirit’s own prosopon to the Son about the Father” in these verses.<sup>215</sup> Here Bates assumes a certain measure of “continuity in hermeneutical logic” between the author of Hebrews and Justin,<sup>216</sup> and indeed this is certainly a plausible interpretation. But the ambiguity of Hebrews at this point (something that is all the more striking in light of the fact that the Spirit does explicitly speak through the Old Testament elsewhere in the letter, as we have seen above) and the fluidity we have seen among early Christian writings in assigning speakers to dialogical passages in the Psalter should prevent us from moving Bates’s interpretation from the realm of the plausible to that of the probable. The parallels between Justin and these passages are summarized in Table 6 above.

These three passages from Hebrews, each in their own way, have elements of thematic coherence with respect to Justin, but Justin’s minimal use of Hebrews elsewhere in his writings weakens the argument for influence with respect to recurrence and availability. The case for Justin having been influenced by the

215     Bates, *Birth*, 165.

216     *Ibid.*

TABLE 7 *Elements of Justin's innovative pneumatology in key New Testament passages*

Passage	Primary speaker	True testimony	Subject: God	Recipient: God
John 15:26–27		×	×	
1 John 5:6–9		×	×	
1 Cor 12:3			×	
1 Cor 2:10–12		×	×	
Heb 3:7–11	×			
Heb 10:15–17	×	×		
Heb 1:8–9			×	×

ideas found in Hebrews is therefore in my accounting weaker than the case for the Johannine or Pauline ideas described above.

In sum, we simply cannot say with certainty that Justin drew upon any individual or combination of these New Testament texts in developing his link between the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony. In light of the criteria of availability, thematic coherence, and explanatory power, it seems that, of the texts studied above, John 15:26–27 and 1 John 5:6–9 are the most likely influences on Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56.14–15, but even these verses cannot account for all of the moves we find Justin making in that passage. It is only when we also take into consideration the ideas about the Spirit implicit in 1 Corinthians and Hebrews that we possess biblical examples of all the most significant elements needed to construct this particular pneumatological innovation. Our results can be summarized in Table 7 above.

Though we cannot definitively say that Justin drew upon all of these New Testament texts, much less speculate on the exact manner in which Justin synthesized them into his own articulation of the Spirit's work in providing Trinitarian testimony, it nevertheless demonstrates some measure of theological continuity in the early church insofar as all of these critical seeds of Justin's ideas were in fact rooted in the fertile soil of the New Testament itself. As such, Justin was positioned to defend the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son on the basis of the same Spirit that was not only encountered in the Christians' lives and worship but also attested to on the pages of their sacred Scriptures, in both Old and New Testaments.<sup>217</sup>

217 In light of the likelihood that many of the works of the so-called Apostolic Fathers were written in the same period that some of the later New Testament works were written, it is



### Justin Martyr: Summary and Implications

In this chapter, we have demonstrated that Justin portrays the Spirit as providing testimony to the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son in *Dial.* 56.14–15, an extension of the *topos* of divine testimony that I have termed Trinitarian testimony. On account of the preceding analysis, we are now equipped to summarize the answers to the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter.

First, concerning the reading strategy that Justin is applying to the Old Testament to create this particular interpretation, we have seen that he employs prosopological exegesis in order to identify instances of the Spirit speaking theodramatically from its own person in certain Old Testament dialogues. This reading strategy would have been readily understood by other educated people of his day. In our analysis of *Dial.* 56.14–15, we discovered important similarities shared by the quotations Justin assigns to the Spirit; namely, they are all instances in which the Old Testament is being interpreted prosopologically from the person of the Spirit for the purpose of testifying to the divinity or the lordship of the Father and the Son.

Second, regarding the extent to which the Spirit's role of thus testifying is distinctive, having undertaken a thorough examination of all the instances of Justin's use of prosopological exegesis from divine speakers, we determined that only the Spirit, and not the Father or the Son, speaks prosopologically for the purpose of providing intra-divine testimony. This testifying function of the Spirit, with the exception of Gen 19:24, is particularly associated with its presentation as a primary speaking agent.

Third, concerning whether this was in fact Justin's innovation or that of his sources, we have concluded that despite the fact that Justin relied extensively

---

worth pointing out that a search of that corpus reveals no further developments that may have influenced Justin beyond what we have found in the New Testament passages noted above. The only possible exception is a reference in the Greek version of Aristides's *Apol.* 15.1 (SC 470:286) that Christ is confessed (ὁμολογεῖται) as the Son of God by the Holy Spirit. This reference, however, is not present in the Syriac form of the text, and because the Greek text is only preserved in an eighth-century Greek novel, there are concerns about which version has priority as well as the stability of the Greek textual tradition; cf. Peter Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, SNTSMS 10 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 207–210. For text and further overview of the relevant issues, see the edition of Bernard Pouderon, et al., ed. and trans., *Aristide: Apologie*, SC 470 (Paris: Cerf, 2003). Beyond this, examples of the Spirit speaking the words of the Old Testament in a secondary, inspiring sense can be found in, e.g., *1 Clem.* 13.1, 16.2, 22.1 (LCL 24:56, 62, 76). The Spirit speaks new words to the author's audience in Ignatius, *Phld.* 7.2 (LCL 24:290).

on *testimonia* sources in composing *Dial.*, it is almost certainly the case that Justin's exegesis in *Dial.* 56.14–15 was his own innovation, both with respect to his overall interpretation of the Old Testament theophanies as well as his specific use of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Spirit.

Fourth, with respect to the historical and theological contexts that may have led Justin to articulate this particular view of the Spirit, we have concluded that Justin's theology developed as a result of dialogue and debate with at least three other groups: the Jews, the Marcionites, and the Middle Platonists. Although Justin's argument in *Dial.* 56 makes sense in each of these three contexts, his decision to link the Spirit with Trinitarian testimony is best explained by his efforts to engage with Judaism and thereby construct a distinctive Christian identity.

Fifth, regarding the New Testament ideas that may have influenced Justin, having surveyed relevant pneumatological texts from the Johannine corpus, 1 Corinthians, and Hebrews, we concluded that only a combination of these various biblical "raw materials" can fully account for Justin's pneumatological innovation. Justin appears to be most clearly influenced by John 15:26–27 and 1 John 5:6–9, but we cannot rule out the further influence of passages such as 1 Cor 2:10–12 and Heb 3:7–11 on Justin's thinking.

Having answered these important questions, we are finally ready to consider the significance of these findings for the later development of Christian pneumatology. Besides being the first to identify the Spirit as a divine person (at least in theodramatic terms), Justin's most important legacy with respect to the Spirit arguably comes from his use of the terms *θεολογέω* and *κυριολογέω* to describe the action of the Spirit in testifying to the Father and the Son. As noted above, Justin appears to have been the first person to introduce these terms to Christian discourse; neither of these verbs appear in the Septuagint, the New Testament, or the Apostolic Fathers. Both these words, however, played a large role in later discourse about the nature of the Spirit. To take just two examples, Athanasius uses the verb *θεολογέω* with respect to the Spirit, albeit in a significantly different way; whereas for Justin it is the Son that the Spirit "calls God," Athanasius himself "calls God" the Spirit.<sup>218</sup> Similarly, with respect to the verb *κυριολογέω*, Basil of Caesarea uses this exact term when he "calls Lord" the Spirit.<sup>219</sup> Though the words are now being used as evidence of the deity and

218 *Ep. Serap.* 1.31 (PG 26:601A); cf. Origen, *Exp. Prov.* 22.28 (PG 17:221B). See also Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.* 23.12 (SC 270:304–306), who suggests that the Spirit's graciousness to Christians is linked with their confession of the Spirit's deity.

219 *Spir.* 21.52 (SC 17:208). As his biblical proof-text for this claim, Basil appeals to 2 Cor 3:17–18; on the argument of this passage and its implications for Basil's pneumatology, see further

lordship of the Spirit as opposed to as descriptions of an action of the Spirit, the linkage between the Spirit and the verbs θεολογέω and κυριολογέω in these later writers suggests that Justin stands at the beginning of a theological trajectory that would more fully blossom in the pro-Nicene writings of figures such as Athanasius and Basil.<sup>220</sup>

These conclusions have implications for our understanding of the development of early Christian pneumatology. According to both the traditional account as well as the revised schema of Ayres and Barnes, Justin plays an insignificant role. However, as this book will continue to argue, Justin's invention of the link between the Spirit and intra-divine (and particularly Trinitarian) testimony initiated a theological trajectory that would have far-reaching implications for the development of early Christian pneumatology. Justin, then, deserves more credit for his pneumatology than other accounts have given him.

This brings us to the end of our study of Justin Martyr and his understanding of the relationship between the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony. We now turn our attention to Irenaeus of Lyons, seeking to build off this chapter by identifying concrete continuities and discontinuities between his portrayal of the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony and that of Justin.

---

Michael A.G. Haykin, *The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*, VCSup 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 154–159. Chris L. De Wet, "Emancipating the Spirit: Slavery in Basil of Caesarea's *De Spiritu Sancto*" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, Atlanta, November 2015), 7–8, points out that Basil is actually using the term κυριολογέω in a double manner, also drawing on the sense of the word that refers to an accurate and literal reading of Scripture. For an additional example of the use of this term in the pneumatological debates of the late fourth century, see Ps.-Basil, *Eunom.* 5 (PG 29:753.9–10).

220 Basil also echoes Justin's link between the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony in *Spir.* 18.46 (SC 17:195–197), with the Spirit portrayed as the person who reveals and glorifies the Father and the Son.

## Irenaeus and the Refinement of the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit

In this chapter, we turn to Irenaeus of Lyons, often considered to be the individual most responsible for defending—if not outright inventing—Christian orthodoxy in the latter half of the second century.<sup>1</sup> Our task in the following pages, per the overall focus of this book, will be to examine how Irenaeus understood the link between the Spirit and testimony to other divine persons, with special attention to a key passage in book 3 of his *Against Heresies* (ca. 185 C.E.). In particular, we will find that Irenaeus's presentation of this topic is both similar to and different from what we encountered in the previous chapter in the writings of Justin Martyr.<sup>2</sup> We will not only observe the specific ways in which

- 
- 1 The view that Irenaeus “invented” Christian orthodoxy is a popular one in scholarship today; see, for instance, David Brakke, *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 1–28. For a more sympathetic reading of Irenaeus as a defender of orthodoxy, see, e.g., Mary Ann Donovan, *One Right Reading? A Guide to Irenaeus* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997). For an overview of the life of Irenaeus, see F.R.M. Hitchcock, *Irenaeus of Lugdunum: A Study of His Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 1–18; Morton S. Enslin, “Irenaeus: Mostly Prolegomena,” *HTR* 40 (1947): 137–165; Pierre Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens: Des II<sup>e</sup> et III<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris: Cerf, 1961), 92–104; Robert M. Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, ECF (London: Routledge, 1997), 1–10; Eric Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 1–7; Denis Minns, *Irenaeus: An Introduction* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 1–13; Paul Parvis, “Who Was Irenaeus? An Introduction to the Man and His Work,” in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*, ed. Paul Foster and Sara Parvis (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 13–24; John Behr, *Irenaeus of Lyons: Identifying Christianity*, Christian Theology in Context (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 66–71; Jackson Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity*, VCSup 127 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 18–41. For an overview of recent Irenaeian scholarship, see the collection of essays in Paul Foster and Sara Parvis, eds., *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).
  - 2 This chapter assumes Irenaeus's familiarity with the writings of Justin Martyr, as convincingly demonstrated by J. Armitage Robinson, intro. and trans., *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (London: SPCK, 1920), 6–14. See further Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity*, 22–26. Given that Irenaeus appears to have been in Rome when Justin was at the height of his career, it is plausible that the two men even had some degree of personal acquaintance; Michael Slusser, “How Much Did Irenaeus Learn from Justin?” *StPatr* 40 (2006): 515–520, goes so far as to suggest that Irenaeus was one of Justin's students. In any event, in his own writings Irenaeus speaks highly of Justin and names him as a source for his heresiological writings, as at

Irenaeus extends and transforms Justin's earlier pneumatological innovation but also consider the theological and historical contexts—namely, Irenaeus's conflict with Gnosticism<sup>3</sup>—that may have led Irenaeus to advance this particular argument by means of both prosopological exegesis as well as explicit statements concerning the work of the Spirit in the divine economy. By the conclusion of this chapter, we will have identified and analyzed a second witness to the strand of early Christian pneumatology that linked the Spirit with intra-divine or even Trinitarian testimony, shedding additional light on how Irenaeus fits into the development of early Christian views of the Spirit.

First, though, we must provide some context by setting out some of the most significant scholarly views of Irenaeus's pneumatology. Adolf Harnack represented a large strand of scholarship charging that Irenaeus's view of the Holy

---

*Haer.* 1.28.1, 4.6.2, 5.26.2 (SC 264:356; SC 100:440; SC 153:334). As such, we will assume Irenaeus's direct use of Justin's writings, though the extent to which Irenaeus may have been influenced by Justin's view of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit will be explored and validated later in this chapter.

- 3 The theological communities that Irenaeus collectively termed "Gnostics," as at *Haer.* 1.11.1 (SC 264:170), have, in the wake of the discovery and publication of the Nag Hammadi library, received a critical reappraisal from scholars determined to re-present these "lost Christianities" in a light different from that in which Irenaeus has cast them. While a complete, comprehensive introduction to Gnosticism is well beyond the scope of this book, see Robert M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1959); Alastair H.B. Logan, *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996); Karen L. King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); Nicola Denzey Lewis, *Introduction to "Gnosticism": Ancient Voices, Christian Worlds* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). On problems with the term "Gnostic," see, e.g., M.A. Williams, *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 29–53; Brakke, *Gnostics*, 1–51. Despite the fact that this term masks real diversity within various early Christian groups, the fact that they nevertheless had enough in common in Irenaeus's eyes to be linked together under this label allows us to continue using this term even while recognizing its limitations. Given that *Haer.* has the stated aim of refuting the disciples of Ptolemaeus, identified by Irenaeus as part of the Valentinian school of Gnosticism, our discussion of Gnostic pneumatology will focus on that of the Valentinians; in any event, as for the non-Valentinian Gnostics, Irenaeus seems to indicate that their pneumatology appears to have differed in detail but not in substance from that of the Valentinians; cf. *Haer.* 1.29.4, 1.30.1 (SC 264:362, 364). For a historical reconstruction of Valentinianism in light of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi codices, the definitive modern work on the subject is now Einar Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed: The Church of the "Valentinians"*, NHMS 60 (Leiden: Brill, 2006); see also Lewis, *Introduction to "Gnosticism"*, 66–99; Michel R. Desjardins, *Sin in Valentinianism*, SBLDS 108 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 67–116.

Spirit is often obscure and inconsistent.<sup>4</sup> This view seems to emphasize Irenaeus's less substantive portrayal of the Spirit in the early books of *Haer.*, neglecting the more developed account of the Spirit found in the latter half of that work as well as that process of development itself.<sup>5</sup> However, beginning with Henry Swete and J. Armitage Robinson, another line of scholarship has identified an overall high pneumatology in Irenaeus, pointing to how Irenaeus places the Spirit alongside the Father and the Son in the *regula fidei* as well as how Irenaeus manages to avoid confusing the functions of the Spirit and the Son, as was characteristic of previous approaches to the Spirit.<sup>6</sup> The most important recent articulation of this view is that of Lewis Ayres and Michel René Barnes, who in their revised account of the development of early Christian pneumatology present Irenaeus as the author of a mature, sophisticated synthesis of Jewish and Christian pneumatological traditions, bringing to a close the first of their three stages of development.<sup>7</sup>

Two recent monographs on Irenaeus have provided more detail and nuance to the perspective of Ayres and Barnes. Anthony Briggman, working within this trend of scholarship that emphasizes the influence of Second Temple Jewish traditions of the Spirit on the earliest phase of the development of Christian pneumatology, traces Irenaeus's evolving pneumatology over the course of his writings.<sup>8</sup> For Briggman, it is not until *Haer.* book 3 that Irenaeus's view of the Spirit develops well beyond anything that he or any other writer had previously described; the sheer diversity of pneumatological themes that emerge beginning in *Haer.* book 3 is nothing short of "astounding" compared to what

4 Adolf Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. Neil Buchanan, 7 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1896–1905), 2:267 n. 2.

5 As pointed out by Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity*, 164–165.

6 Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1912), 84–94; Robinson, *Demonstration*, 34–68. On Irenaeus's use of the *regula fidei*, see Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 11–17; Everett Ferguson, *The Rule of Faith: A Guide*, Cascade Companions 20 (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015), 17–19, 35–39.

7 See again the introduction of this book; cf. Lewis Ayres and Michel René Barnes, "Pneumatology: Historical and Methodological Considerations," *AugStud* 39 (2008): 163–236, and especially Michel René Barnes, "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology," *AugStud* 39 (2008): 170–180. Barnes explores Irenaeus's pneumatology in more detail in idem, "Irenaeus's Trinitarian Theology," *NV* 7 (2009): 67–106, esp. 71–72, 93–104.

8 Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). This appears to be the first monograph devoted to the subject since Hans-Jochen Jaschke, *Der Heilige Geist im Bekenntnis der Kirche: Eine Studie zur Pneumatologie des Irenäus von Lyon im Ausgang vom altchristlichen Glaubensbekenntnis*, MBT 40 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1976).

he believes to be the more limited and primitive pneumatology of Justin Martyr and even how Irenaeus described the Spirit previously in *Haer.*<sup>9</sup> By *Haer.* books 4 and 5, Irenaeus is putting forward a mature theology of the Spirit as Creator, demonstrating both the Spirit's divinity and its creative agency. Significantly for Briggman's understanding of how Irenaeus fits into the broader spectrum of the development of early Christian pneumatology, these themes are deeply rooted in the theological milieu of Second Temple Judaism, with the result that he characterizes Irenaeus's view of the Spirit as "the most complex Jewish-Christian pneumatology of the period."<sup>10</sup> Thus, for Briggman, Irenaeus's pneumatology stands in contrast with that of Justin. For his part, Justin operated within a paradigm of Spirit-Christology grounded in an angelomorphic pneumatology and Christology that did not allow him to fully move beyond his binitarian logic to a thoroughly Trinitarian notion of God. Irenaeus, on the other hand, did not share these tendencies, instead crafting a genuinely Triune picture of God that anticipated the position which would be articulated at Nicaea.<sup>11</sup> Thus Irenaeus, even more so than Justin, was heavily indebted to Jewish ways of thinking even as he modified and transformed them in light of distinctively Christian ideas.

Appearing shortly after Briggman's work on Irenaeus's pneumatology, Jackson Lashier's study of Irenaeus's Trinitarianism devotes one entire chapter to the Holy Spirit, arguing that, in contrast to Justin and other early Christian apologists, Irenaeus presented a clear case for the distinct personhood and function of the Holy Spirit on account of the Spirit's unique role in creation and in inspiring the Hebrew prophets.<sup>12</sup> Lashier does not, however, sharpen his analysis of this latter point to include prosopological exegesis or to distinguish between the Spirit's primary and secondary speech; in fact, he goes so far as to say that "Irenaeus simply does not find in the work of prophecy an occasion to develop

9 Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 96. Irenaeus's new pneumatological insights were perhaps, as Briggman suggests, partially the result of his reading of Theophilus's *Ad Autolyicum*; cf. Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 97–103.

10 Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 146–147.

11 Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 182–203. "While Irenaeus refers to the divine component of Jesus Christ as Spirit, he does so in order to identify the common divine 'stuff' shared by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. That is to say, by labeling the divine component of Jesus as Spirit, he is simply stating that Jesus is divine" (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 183).

12 Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity*, 149–188. It is again worth noting that Briggman and Lashier were both students of Michel René Barnes at Marquette University; the influence of Barnes's schema of the development of early Christian pneumatology can be observed in both.

the Spirit's nature or the Trinitarian nature of the act itself."<sup>13</sup> As we will see in this chapter, however, Irenaeus develops the idea of the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony in such a way as to challenge Lashier on both of these points. In sum, like Briggman, Lashier emphasizes the discontinuity between Irenaeus and Justin with respect to their views of the Spirit, with Irenaeus's most important pneumatological source being not Justin but Theophilus.

Thus, relying on the findings of the previous chapter of this book, we will now seek to nuance the position of Briggman and Lashier by pointing out an important continuity between the pneumatologies of Justin and Irenaeus, examining how the latter received and adapted to new circumstances the innovation of the former with respect to prosopological exegesis and Trinitarian testimony.

### Irenaeus and the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit

As noted above, it is not until *Haer.* book 3 that Irenaeus begins to flesh out his picture of the Holy Spirit in some particularly interesting ways as he adapts and expands earlier pneumatologies. We see this process at work with reference to the relationship between the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony in our key passage for this chapter, *Haer.* 3.6.1. In context, this passage serves an important role in the overall structure of *Haer.*, as Irenaeus is transitioning from describing Gnostic beliefs to presenting his own theological position.<sup>14</sup> Having discussed the importance of the right interpretation of Scripture, Irenaeus makes the following argument:

Therefore, neither the Lord nor the Holy Spirit nor the apostles would have ever definitely and absolutely named "God" one who is not God, unless he was truly God; nor would they have ever from their own persons called anyone "Lord" except God the Father, who has dominion over all things, and his Son, who has received from his Father lordship over all creation, as this [passage] pronounces: *The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet* [Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1)]. Indeed this shows the Father speaking to the Son, who both gave to him the inheritance of the Gentiles and subjected all enemies to

<sup>13</sup> Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity*, 186.

<sup>14</sup> Stephen O. Presley, "Irenaeus and the Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology," in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*, ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 169.



him. Since, therefore, the Father is truly Lord and the Son truly Lord, the Holy Spirit has deservedly designated them with the name of “Lord.” And again, concerning the destruction of the Sodomites, Scripture says, *And the Lord rained on Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven* [Gen 19:24]. Here indeed it points out that the Son, who had also spoken with Abraham, had received power from the Father to judge the Sodomites on account of their iniquity. Similarly, this [passage] pronounces: *Your throne, O God, is forever; the scepter of your kingdom is a scepter of righteousness. You have loved justice, and have hated iniquity; therefore God, your God, has anointed you* [Ps 45:6–7 (LXX 44:7–8)]. For the Spirit has designated both of them with the name of “God”—the Son who is anointed and the Father who anoints.<sup>15</sup>

Leaving aside the specific nuances of Irenaeus's argument for now, we may immediately recognize the similarities with *Dial.* 56.14–15, as Irenaeus, like Justin, cites the classic “two powers” texts of Ps 110:1, Gen 19:24, and Ps 45:6–7 to justify the Christian belief in the deity of the Son; moreover, Irenaeus follows Justin in interpreting these verses as the Spirit “designating” the Son, alongside the Father, as “Lord” and “God.” At first glance, therefore, it appears Irenaeus is simply adopting Justin's views on the role of the Spirit with respect to that form of intra-divine testimony that we are calling Trinitarian testimony, with the volume of the parallels suggesting some degree of literary dependence.<sup>16</sup>

15 *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:64–66): Neque igitur Dominus neque Spiritus sanctus neque apostoli eum qui non esset Deus definitiue et absolute Deum nominassent aliquando nisi esset uere Deus; neque Dominum appellassent aliquem ex sua persona nisi qui dominatur omnium Deum Patrem, et Filium eius qui dominium accepit a Patre suo omnis conditionis, quemadmodum habet illud: *Dixit Dominus Domino meo: Sede ad dexteram meam, quousque ponam inimicos tuos suppedaneum pedum tuorum.* Patrem enim Filio collocutum ostendit, qui et dedit ei hereditatem gentium et subiecit ei omnes inimicos. Vere igitur cum Pater sit Dominus et Filius uere sit Dominus, merito Spiritus sanctus Domini appellatione signauit eos. Et iterum in euerisione Sodomitarum Scriptura ait: *Et pluuit Dominus super Sodomam et Gomorram ignem et sulfur a Domino de caelo.* Filium enim hic significat, qui et Abraham collocutus sit, a Patre accepisse potestatem adiudicandi Sodomitas propter iniquitatem eorum. Similiter habet illud: *Sedes tua, Deus, in aeternum; uirga directionis uirga regni tui. Dilexisti iustitiam, et odisti iniquitatem; propterea unxit te, Deus, Deus tuus.* Vtrosque enim Dei appellatione signauit Spiritus, et eum qui ungitur Filium et eum qui ungit, id est Patrem.

16 Especially given that this pneumatological innovation was, as argued in the preceding chapter of this book, the creation of Justin and not his sources, it seems most plausible

Of potentially greater interest, however, is the fact that Irenaeus then extends Justin's argument to present the Spirit as speaking through Scripture to testify to the Father and the Son in additional verses. Still speaking of the Spirit, Irenaeus writes:

And again, *God has stood in the congregation of the gods; he judges in the midst of the gods* [Ps 82:1 (LXX 81:1)]. It [the Spirit] is speaking of the Father and the Son and of those who have received adoption; those, however, are the Church, for she is the congregation of God, which God—that is, the Son—has assembled by himself. Of him again [the Spirit] says, *The God of gods, the Lord has spoken and has summoned the earth* [Ps 50:1 (LXX 49:1)]. Which God? The one of whom it [the Spirit] has said, *God will come manifestly, our God, and he will not keep silent* [Ps 50:3 (LXX 49:3)]. This is the Son, who came to human beings according to the manifestation, who says, *I have shown myself plainly to those who do not seek me* [Isa 65:1/Rom 10:20]. But of what gods [is he God]? [Of those] to whom he says, *I have said: You are gods and all sons of the Most High* [Ps 82:6 (LXX 81:6)]. Of those, of course, who have received the grace of adoption, by which we cry, *Abba, Father* [Rom 8:15].<sup>17</sup>

Irenaeus thus extends Justin's argument by including quotations of Ps 82:1 and 50:1, 3 to make the same point concerning the Spirit calling the Son "God" in passages of Scripture that describe multiple divine beings. Unlike Justin, however, we see Irenaeus using these scriptural quotations to buttress his position on the filial adoption of believers. Following this passage, Irenaeus turns to the subject of idolatry, making clear that it is only the Father and the Son who are

---

that Irenaeus was dependent on Justin and not one of Justin's sources. The existence of minor differences in the wording of the biblical quotations, which is often a marker of dependence upon a different tradition such as an earlier *testimonia* source, is complicated by the fact that this passage comes down to us in Latin and not the original Greek, which would have provided a more precise form of comparison with Justin.

- 17 *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:66–68): Et iterum: *Deus stetit in synagoga deorum, in medio autem deos discernit.* De Patre et Filio et de his qui adoptionem perceperunt dicit; hi autem sunt Ecclesia: haec enim est synagoga Dei, quam Deus, hoc est Filius, ipse per semetipsum collegit. De quo iterum dicit: *Deus deorum Dominus locutus est et uocavit terram.* Quis Deus? De quo dixit: *Deus manifeste ueniet, Deus noster, et non silebit,* hoc est Filius, qui secundum manifestationem hominibus aduenit, qui dicit: *Palam apparui his qui me non quaerunt.* Quorum autem deorum? Quibus dicit: *Ego dixi: Dii estis et filii Altissimi omnes,* his scilicet qui adoptionis gratiam adepti sunt, per quam *clamamus: Abba Pater.*

called “God” and “Lord” in the Scriptures;<sup>18</sup> again, we may note that idolatry was not a topic of interest for Justin in *Dial.* 56.

These points of continuity and discontinuity raise a number of interesting questions to be explored over the course of this chapter: How does Irenaeus develop his understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, particularly with respect to prosopological exegesis? How does Irenaeus link the Spirit with the notion of Trinitarian testimony in the context of his broader theological schema, and what role did his engagement with Gnosticism play in the formulation of his argument in *Haer.* 3.6.1?

By answering each of these questions in turn, we will be better equipped to distinguish Irenaeus’s vision of the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony from that of his predecessor Justin. As in the case of Justin, before we can provide a more detailed examination of how Irenaeus is using prosopological exegesis in a key passage concerning the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony, we must first step back and consider how Irenaeus uses prosopological exegesis more broadly. Having done so, we will then return to *Haer.* 3.6.1 and examine the logic by which Irenaeus attributes these particular quotations to the person of the Spirit.

### *Irenaeus’s Use of Prosopological Exegesis*

Compared with Justin and Tertullian, Irenaeus received very little scholarly attention in early studies of prosopological exegesis.<sup>19</sup> Two recent studies have, however, taken the first steps in rectifying this lacuna. First, Stephen Presley has contended that the lack of scholarly interest in Irenaeus’s use of prosopological exegesis is due to the polemical nature of Irenaeus’s writing; on account of the fact that his Gnostic opponents also make use of this reading strategy, Irenaeus uses it on occasion but comes across as being “not nearly as enamored” with the method as were Justin and Tertullian.<sup>20</sup> For Presley, however, this context actually makes Irenaeus a particularly important utilizer of prosopological exegesis

18 *Haer.* 3.6.2–5 (SC 211:68–80).

19 These minimal analyses of Irenaeus’s use of prosopological exegesis include Michael Slusser, “The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology,” *TS* 49 (1988): 464 n. 15; Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier Recherches et bilan, 2: Exégèse prosopologique et théologie* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1985), 29.

20 Presley, “Exegetical Roots,” 166. On the Gnostics’ use of prosopological exegesis, Presley (“Exegetical Roots,” 167–169) points to *Haer.* 1.7.3 (SC 264:106) as a good example of Irenaeus recording one such instance. An example of the Holy Spirit speaking as an inspiring secondary agent the words of the Old Testament can be found in the Nag Hammadi codices at *Exeg. Soul* (NHC II,6) 129.5.

insofar as he is therefore forced to more carefully articulate his method and its relationship to his broader understanding of how to correctly interpret Scripture.<sup>21</sup> Following upon the work of Presley, Matthew Bates has demonstrated how Irenaeus set out careful hermeneutical principles by which he could claim that his prosopological readings were superior to those of the Gnostics.<sup>22</sup> Thus, for Bates as well as for Presley, Irenaeus's significance lies in how he validates his prosopological interpretations with respect to those of his opponents.

However, the most recent studies of Irenaeus's pneumatology by Barnes and his students have not been attentive to his use of prosopological exegesis. This is likely because this model tends to ignore strands of pneumatological development that are not related to Christian adoption of Jewish ideas concerning the Spirit. Indeed, Barnes himself comments that his work is explicitly "denying the thesis that 'The [Christian] doctrine of the Spirit had to be constructed from the ground up using only the materials provided by the Scriptures.'"<sup>23</sup> As such, it is not surprising that one potentially significant pneumatological trajectory drawing not on a pre-existing Jewish conception of the Spirit but on a close reading of the Scriptures according to reading strategies set out in Greco-Roman rhetorical handbooks has been thus excluded.<sup>24</sup> This chapter, then, will build on and expand the insights of Presley and Bates with respect to Irenaeus's use of prosopological exegesis and apply them to the Ayres-Barnes model of the development of early Christian pneumatology.

Although he does not give an entire extended aside to the subject of prosopological exegesis as did Justin, Irenaeus does give some description of his method in chapters 49–50 of his *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (*Epideixis*, ca. 190 C.E.). In context (*Epid.* 43–52), Irenaeus is endeavoring to prove the eternal existence of Christ from the Old Testament. Within the smaller unit of *Epid.* 47–51, Irenaeus is concerned with showing how David and Isaiah speak of both the Father and the Son.<sup>25</sup> As one means of defend-

---

21 Presley, "Exegetical Roots," 167.

22 Matthew W. Bates, *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 183–188.

23 Barnes, "Beginning and End," 170.

24 While it is true that some Hellenistic Jewish writers such as Philo of Alexandria made use of prosopological exegesis, as noted by, e.g., Matthew W. Bates, *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Interpretation* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012), 211–212, there are no real parallels to suggest that this is in any way an aspect of "Jewish pneumatology." See also Bates, *Birth*, 31.

25 For overview of the structure of this section of *Epid.*, see further John Behr, intro. and

ing this position, Irenaeus turns to some of the oft-cited dialogical texts of the Old Testament, quoting Ps 2:7–8, Ps 110:1, and Isa 45:1, first noting that, in light of the fact that David did not receive the things promised in these texts, they must therefore refer to the Son. Irenaeus at this point addresses the topic of prosopological exegesis directly:

Since the same promise is made by both prophets [that is, David and Isaiah], namely that he would be king, so the words of God are [addressed] to one and the same, by this, I say, to Christ the Son of God. Since David says, *The Lord said to me* [Ps 2:7], it is necessary to say that since it is not David nor a certain other of the prophets who speaks from himself—for it is not a human being who speaks prophecies—but [that] the Spirit of God, forming and shaping itself like the persons (*personae*; πρόσωπον) that have been set forth, was speaking in the prophets, producing speech sometimes from Christ and sometimes from the Father. Thus Christ suitably says through David that the Father himself speaks with him, and most reasonably he also says other things through the prophets concerning himself, just as, among others, through Isaiah in this way: *And now thus says the Lord, who formed me from the womb to be his servant, to gather Jacob and to gather Israel to him; and I will be glorified in the presence of the Lord, and my God will be my strength. And he said: It will be a great thing for you to be called my servant, to establish the tribes of Jacob and to turn back the dispersion of Israel; and I have placed you to be a light for the Gentiles, that you may be for salvation unto the end of the earth* [Isa 49:5–6].<sup>26</sup>

---

trans., *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: On the Apostolic Preaching*, PPS 17 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997), 21–22.

- 26 *Epid.* 49–50 (sc 406:156): Eadem enim promissio per ambos prophetas, (scilicet) regem (futurum) esse eum. Itaque ad unum et eundem loquela Dei est, hoc dico ad Christum Filium Dei. Quoniam David dicit: *Dominus dixit ad me*, necessarium est dicere quoniam non David est qui loquitur neque alius quidam ex prophetis ipse a semetipso—non enim homo est qui dicit prophetias—, sed Dei Spiritus, formans-et-figurans-seipsum-similem (συσχηματίζομαι) propositae (προκειμένος) personae (πρόσωπον), in prophetis loquebatur, aliquando (quidem) a Christo, aliquando autem a Patre faciebat sermones. Igitur convenienter-apte (ἐπιτηδείως) Christus per David dicit ipsum cum ipso Patrem loqui, et convenienter-merito (εἰκότως) et reliqua ipse de se per prophetas dicit, quemadmodum et in aliis et in Esaia in modum hunc: *Et nunc sic dicit Dominus qui plasmavit me servum suum ex utero, congregare Iacob et Israel ad eum congregare; et glorificabor coram Domino, et Deus meus erit mihi virtus. Et dixit: Magnum erit tibi vocari servus meus, statuere-et-firmare* (ἵστημι) *tribus Iacob et dispersionem Israelis convertere; et posui te in*

This passage is very similar to Justin's presentation of prosopological exegesis in *1 Apol.* 36.1–2.<sup>27</sup> Irenaeus, like Justin, believes that the proper interpretation of certain dialogical texts requires identifying the divine person who is the ultimate source of the words spoken by the prophet. Also as in Justin's overview, Irenaeus presents a divine power or being that has the potential to take on the character of the Father and the Son and thereby introduce their speech into the biblical record. It is important to note that Irenaeus identifies this being as the Spirit of God; this clears up one source of confusion in Justin insofar as *1 Apol.* 36.1–2 attributes this role to the Logos while *Dial.* 56.14 attributes it to the Spirit. Further echoing Justin's overview, Irenaeus here presents the Spirit (the Logos in Justin) as being only able to speak from the characters of the Father and the Son and not from its own person; thus, Irenaeus in this passage seems to have in view only the Spirit's capacity to speak theodramatically as an inspiring secondary agent but not as a primary speaking agent. Indeed, Irenaeus goes on to cite Isa 49:5–6 as just such an instance of speech from the persons of the Father and the Son; there is no mention here, however, of the Spirit speaking any words as its own divine person, as it is the Son who is himself reporting the Father's words in addition to his own.<sup>28</sup> Again as with Justin, in Irenaeus the Spirit primarily functions as the power through which the prophets spoke and as the general inspiring force behind the words of Scripture.<sup>29</sup>

If, however, there is one key difference between Justin and Irenaeus at this point, it is that all of Irenaeus's examples of prosopological exegesis are speech from one divine person to or concerning another divine person.<sup>30</sup> In Justin's overview of prosopological exegesis (*1 Apol.* 36–45), he gives many examples of what he believes to be prosopological speech from the Father and the Son that do not fit in this category; instead, in the former case they are primarily rebukes

---

*lucem gentium, esse te in salutem usque ad extremum terrae.* Parentheses are original to the edition of Rousseau.

27 Rondeau (*Les commentaires patristiques*, 29) also makes note of these similarities.

28 Interestingly, in *Epid.* 48 (SC 406:152–154), just prior to Irenaeus's reference to prosopological exegesis, he cites Ps 110 but assigns the words merely to David and not to the Spirit, as we might expect.

29 See, for example, *Haer.* 2.34.3, 3.7.2, 3.16.2, 4.8.1, 4.11.1, 4.20.5–8, 4.33.1 (SC 294:358; SC 100:84, 294; SC 211:464, 496, 636–654, 802); *Epid.* 26, 67 (SC 406:120, 178). On this topic, see further Jaschke, *Heilige Geist*, 233–249.

30 With respect to Isa 49:5, the Son refers to the Father in the third person, even as he is apparently addressing the Father. This slightly odd formulation will be addressed in more detail below in the broader discussion of how Irenaeus presents the Son speaking prosopologically.

to Israel and in the latter case they are almost entirely prophecies of Jesus's life and passion. What this appears to suggest, therefore, is that Irenaeus's understanding of prosopological exegesis is more limited than Justin's, limiting it to only those instances in which he believes the Old Testament records dialogue from one divine person to or concerning another divine person (providing some ancient justification for identifying intra-divine dialogue as a distinct subset of what modern scholars have identified as prosopological exegesis).<sup>31</sup>

Though Irenaeus does not in this passage speak directly to the issue of why his prosopological interpretation of these texts is superior to that of his Gnostic opponents, we can infer from other portions of his writings the broader hermeneutic by which he believes he can validate his reading. In a famous passage in *Haer.* book 1, Irenaeus insists that the Gnostics do not teach what Jesus or his apostles handed down; rather, they disregard the order (*ordinem*) and the connection (*textum*) of the Scriptures, thus violating their overall hypothesis (*argumentum*; ὑπόθεσις).<sup>32</sup> In a memorable image, Irenaeus suggests that the Gnostics have ripped up the beautiful image of a king and rearranged the pieces to form a picture of a dog or a fox and then insisted that this was the original image.<sup>33</sup> In contrast, Irenaeus argues that he, like all of the other churches of his time, follows the *regula fidei*, which is an expression of the correct hypothesis of Scripture, covering right belief concerning the Father, the Son, the Spirit, and the coming judgment.<sup>34</sup> As further proof of the superiority of the *regula fidei* to the Gnostic hermeneutic, Irenaeus argues that this way of understanding the Christian religion is the same as that found in the apostolic oral and written proclamation of the gospel, which has subsequently been guarded by means of apostolic succession in the public teachings of the church.<sup>35</sup> Bringing

31 In general, Irenaeus appears to have a preference for selecting dialogical passages from the Old Testament to make his points; see further Charles Kannengiesser, "The 'Speaking God' and Irenaeus's Interpretative Pattern: The Reception of Genesis," *ASE* 15 (1998): 337–352, see esp. 342; Presley, "Exegetical Roots," 166.

32 On Irenaeus's use of the concept of the hypothesis, see Anthony Briggman, "Literary and Rhetorical Theory in Irenaeus, Part 1," *VC* 69 (2015): 502–516.

33 *Haer.* 1.8.1 (SC 264:112–116).

34 *Haer.* 1.10.1 (SC 264:154–158). Grant (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 47) defines the hypothesis as "the presentation (sometimes in a summary) of a plot or structure intended by an author." For more on the *regula fidei*, see Paul M. Blowers, "The *Regula Fidei* and the Narrative Character of Early Christian Faith," *ProEccl* 6 (1997): 199–228. Contra Blowers, Briggman ("Literary and Rhetorical Theory," 506–509) argues that *Haer.* 1.10.1 is better classified as a description of the hypothesis of Scripture and not as a statement of the *regula fidei*. The proper classification of this passage is, however, immaterial for the argument of this chapter.

35 *Haer.* 3.1–4 (SC 211:20–52). For more on the passages mentioned in this paragraph and their

all of this back to prosopological exegesis, then, Irenaeus's argument is that the theological confession of the Father and the Son as "God" and "Lord," as found in the *regula fidei*, precedes the exegetical decision to identify various speaking persons in Old Testament texts.<sup>36</sup> Thus, we may affirm with Presley that one of Irenaeus's most important contributions to the development of Trinitarian theology with respect to prosopological exegesis is the explicit grounding of this reading strategy in the church's historical confession of faith.<sup>37</sup> We have, however, already gone beyond Presley in identifying differences between the prosopological approaches of Justin and Irenaeus, and we will now further explore this issue of continuity and discontinuity with respect to these two early Christian writers' use of prosopological exegesis by focusing specifically upon their portrayal of prosopological speech from the person of the Spirit.

### *The Spirit and Prosopological Exegesis in Haer. 3.6.1*

At this point, we may now return to *Haer.* 3.6.1 and consider, within the broader contours of Irenaeus's approach to prosopological exegesis, why he has attributed these particular Old Testament quotations to the Holy Spirit and how his approach to the prosopological speech of the Spirit compares with that of his predecessor Justin.

In turning to this passage, we must first identify the broader purpose of Irenaeus's polemic in *Haer.* book 3, which is to put forward, against the Gnostics, an interpretation of the Scriptures according to the *regula fidei* and therefore demonstrate that the Son is "one and the same God" as the Father, the Creator of heaven and earth.<sup>38</sup> This emphasis on the nature of the Creator God is a clear

---

relation to Irenaeus's method of biblical interpretation, see further Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 19–21; John Behr, *The Way to Nicaea*, vol. 1 of *Formation of Christian Theology* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 29–45; John J. O'Keefe and R.R. Reno, *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 33–44; Bates, *Birth*, 183–188; Blowers, "Regula Fidei," 211–212.

36 Presley, "Exegetical Roots," 170; cf. Bates, *Birth*, 188: "If a proposed prosopological assignment violates the overarching plot of the Scripture, its consecutive arrangement or its culmination in Christ, then it is not valid."

37 Presley, "Exegetical Roots," 171.

38 Irenaeus M.C. Steenberg, rev., *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies, Book 3*, trans. Dominic J. Unger, ACW 64 (New York: Newman, 2012), 6: "The central theological theme of AH 3 is stated most succinctly by Irenaeus in 3.10.6, at the end of a lengthy discourse on the testimony of Luke and Mark: 'So it is one and the same God and Father who was announced by the prophets, handed down by the Gospel, whom we Christians worship



point of engagement with Gnosticism and fits within a broader dialogue at the time concerning the theology of creation.<sup>39</sup> The Nag Hammadi corpus has demonstrated the diversity of Gnostic characterizations of the world creator, with the Valentinian tradition in general promoting a more positive view of this deity than that of the Sethians.<sup>40</sup> In any event, the form of Valentinianism with which Irenaeus claims to be in dialogue appears to be one in which the world creator is a spiritually inferior being who is ignorant of the true Father God, necessitating the sending of Christ to instruct lost souls concerning true knowledge and resulting salvation.<sup>41</sup> Likewise, Irenaeus's emphasis on the unity of God is clearly in dialogue with the Valentinian understanding of the projection and nature of the Pleroma, which in some accounts featured as many as thirty Aeons, each of whom functions as an intermediate, independent being at some degree of remove from the true Father God.<sup>42</sup> Both the desire to set a supreme deity apart from a series of lesser spirits and the interest in defining and ordering these lesser beings were in fact characteristic of the Middle Platonism of this time.<sup>43</sup> It is with these views in mind, therefore, that Irenaeus sought to demonstrate how Scripture, rightly interpreted, identifies the one true God, in whom the Son is included alongside of the Father.

---

and love with our whole heart as the Creator of heaven and earth and of all things in them.'"

39 Cf. Paul M. Blowers, *The Drama of the Divine Economy: Creator and Creation in Early Christian Theology and Piety*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1–4.

40 King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 159.

41 *Haer.* 1.2.1–5, 1.4.1–2 (SC 264:36–46, 62–74); cf. King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 155. In summary, according to Irenaeus, the Valentinians believed that though only the Aeon Mind had the gift of being able to contemplate the First-Father, the Aeon Wisdom desired to contemplate the First-Father on her own, and this resulted in her fall. Wisdom was later restored with the help of the Aeon Limit, requiring Limit to physically separate Wisdom's unholy passion from herself, which would eventually come to form the material world. For a more complete description and analysis of Irenaeus's presentation of the Valentinians' entire cosmogony and protological myth, see Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity*, 32–36; Lewis, *Introduction to "Gnosticism"*, 63–66; Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 195–200, 257–262; M.C. Steenberg, *Irenaeus on Creation: The Cosmic Christ and the Saga of Redemption*, VCSup 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 22–27.

42 For more on the diversity of Valentinian pleromatology, see Thomassen, *Spiritual Seed*, 193–247.

43 Heidi Marx-Wolf, *Spiritual Taxonomies and Ritual Authority: Platonists, Priests, and Gnostics in the Third Century C.E.*, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 38–70. Marx-Wolf describes this as a "comprehensive philosophical project" that sought to create "complex discourses that mapped and ordered the realm of spirits in more systematic, universal terms" (*Spiritual Taxonomies*, 38).

Having argued that the right interpretation of Scripture has been secured by apostolic succession (*Haer.* 3.3–5), Irenaeus then turns to how the Scriptures, rightly interpreted, witness to the one true God (*Haer.* 3.6–15).<sup>44</sup> Specifically, Irenaeus in *Haer.* 3.6.1–3.9.1 focuses on how the Holy Spirit, the apostles, and Christ reserve the terms “God” and “Lord” for only God the Father and God the Son.<sup>45</sup> To validate this claim, Irenaeus begins with evidence from the Old Testament.<sup>46</sup> The unity of this smaller unit is evident from the consistency of Irenaeus’s argument, which focuses on demonstrating that the Old Testament does not speak of any God besides the one true God, as well as the consistency of his method, which is to prosopologically exegete certain dialogical texts from the Old Testament.<sup>47</sup> Irenaeus opens this section with an account of what names are ascribed to the Son in the Hebrew Scriptures:

Therefore, neither the Lord nor the Holy Spirit nor the apostles would have ever definitely and absolutely named “God” (ἐθεολόγησάν) one who is not God, unless he was truly God (ἀληθῶς Θεός); nor would they have ever from their own persons (ἐξ ἰδίου προσώπου) called anyone “Lord” (ἐκκυριολέκτησάν) except God the Father, who has dominion over all things, and his Son, who has received from his Father lordship over all creation, as this [passage] pronounces: *The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet* [Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1)]. Indeed this shows the Father speaking to the Son, who both gave to him the inheritance of the Gentiles and subjected all enemies to him. Since,

44 Cf. Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 67–77. That this is one cohesive unit is clear from the fact that the thesis set out in 3.6.1 (SC 211:64) is restated in 3.15.3 (SC 211:284), with the argument then shifting in 3.16.1 (SC 211:286–290) to the issues of the incarnation and the nature of Christ.

45 Cf. Bernhard Mutschler, *Das Corpus Johanneum bei Irenäus von Lyon: Studien und Kommentar zum dritten Buch von Adversus Haereses*, WUNT 189 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 28. As Mutschler summarizes the thesis of this section, “Die These lautet, dass das gesamte Schriftzeugnis der Propheten, Apostel und des Herrn übereinstimmend die Begriffe θεός und κύριος verwendet, da es mit diesen Begriffen im Vollsinn ihrer Bedeutung ausschließlich Gott den Vater und Gott den Sohn prädiert” (*Corpus Johanneum*, 28–29). That the Spirit was not itself explicitly identified as God and Lord (and, if anything, was excluded from being considered as such according to the argument of this passage) would of course give rise to the pneumatological controversies of the post-Nicene period.

46 *Haer.* 3.6.1–4 (SC 211:64–76); Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 67–69.

47 Presley, “Exegetical Roots,” 169; starting in *Haer.* 3.6.5 (SC 211:76–80), Irenaeus leaves the Old Testament behind in order to examine the evidence from Paul. Likewise, prosopological exegesis largely disappears from the discussion at this point.

therefore, the Father is truly Lord and the Son truly Lord, the Holy Spirit has deservedly designated them with the name of “Lord.”<sup>48</sup>

We may first note how Irenaeus explicitly introduces this section with the language of prosopological exegesis; by introducing the term “person” (προσώπου) and going on to posit the specific identities of the unnamed persons taking place in the discourse of Ps 110:1, Irenaeus and his readers would all understand that he was employing the ancient reading strategy of prosopological exegesis.<sup>49</sup> Whereas Justin in *Dial.* 56.14 set David, the human speaker of the text, alongside the Spirit, its true speaker in the text’s theodramatic setting, here Irenaeus mentions only the latter to the exclusion of the former, further underscoring his prosopological reading of the passage. As such, reading Ps 110:1 in this light further endows theodramatic personhood on the Spirit insofar as the Spirit is thus portrayed as able to speak of “my Lord” and able to report discourse taking place between the other two divine persons.

As noted above, the two most obvious continuities between Justin and Irenaeus are that both utilize Ps 110:1 as their initial proof-text for identifying the Son as a second God alongside the Father and that both portray the Spirit as the subject of the verbs θεολογέω and κυριολογέω.<sup>50</sup> There are, however, some subtle differences. For instance, Irenaeus provides a more thorough prosopological interpretation of the text, noting both that the words of Ps 110:1b–c are spoken by the Father to the Son and that the words of Ps 110:1a are spoken by the Holy Spirit. A further and more important difference is the polemical context of the prosopological interpretation. Justin’s argument in *Dial.* 56.14 most clearly fits in the context of early Christian self-definition with respect to Judaism, and as such he uses Ps 110:1 as biblical evidence for the possibility of there being a second divine person, whom he identifies as Christ. On the other hand, Irenaeus, in his aforementioned struggle with the Gnostics and what he understands to

48 *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:64–66). Being mindful that Irenaeus wrote in Greek and not Latin, and in order to better make comparison with Justin’s Greek, I will for the rest of this discussion of *Haer.* 3.6.1 focus on the Greek retroversion of Rousseau, though the complete Latin text, to which the reader may on occasion wish to refer, has been provided above.

49 Presley, “Exegetical Roots,” 169. Outside of *Haer.* 3.6 (SC 211:64–80), Irenaeus uses the language of *persona*/πρόσωπον in *Haer.* 3.9.1, 3.10.1, 3.10.5, and 5.25.2 (SC 211:98, 112, 132; SC 153:312).

50 This high degree of volume, combined with the clear availability of Justin’s work to Irenaeus and the frequent recurrence of Justin’s ideas elsewhere in Irenaeus, makes a strong case for influence, if not outright literary dependence, between *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 264:64–68) and *Dial.* 56 (PTS 47:161–167).

be their belief in multiple deities, is more concerned to limit the application of verses such as this to the Father and the Son, who alone are truly God (ἀληθῶς Θεός).<sup>51</sup> In other words, whereas Justin challenges his readers to *broaden* their horizons for the possible referents of this text and others like it, Irenaeus wants to *limit* them.<sup>52</sup> Still, the crucial thing to point out here is that for Irenaeus, as for Justin, the Spirit provides Trinitarian testimony, testifying to the deity and lordship of both the Father and the Son.<sup>53</sup>

Irenaeus continues his argument in *Haer.* 3.6.1 by turning to two further familiar “two powers” texts, Gen 19:24 and Ps 45:6–7:

And again, concerning the destruction of the Sodomites, Scripture says, *And the Lord rained on Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven* [Gen 19:24]. Here indeed it points out (δηλοῖ) that the Son, who had also spoken with Abraham, had received power from the Father to judge the Sodomites on account of their iniquity. Similarly, this [passage] pronounces: *Your throne, O God, is forever; the scepter of your kingdom is a scepter of righteousness. You have loved justice, and have hated iniquity; therefore God, your God, has anointed you* [Ps 45:6–7 (LXX 44:7–8)]. For the Spirit has designated both of them with the name of “God” (τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ προσηγορίᾳ ἐσήμηνε)—the Son who is anointed and the Father who anoints.<sup>54</sup>

As with Justin in *Dial.* 56.14, Irenaeus in *Haer.* 3.6.1 follows Ps 110:1 with a second key “two powers” text from the Psalter, Ps 45:6–7. According to Irenaeus’s interpretation, this text is an example whereby the Spirit designates both the Father and the Son as “God”; thus, Ps 110:1 proves that the Spirit designates the Father and Son as “Lord,” while Ps 45:6–7 demonstrates that the Spirit designates them both as “God.” In both cases, the word “designates” (*appellatione*) was likely in Irenaeus’s original Greek ἐσήμηνε. This Greek verb (σημαίνω), related to the noun for “sign” (σημεῖον), has the meaning of “to show by a sign” and therefore “to point out” or “to indicate.”<sup>55</sup> In this passage, Irenaeus also uses the

51 Presley, “Exegetical Roots,” 169–171.

52 See also *Haer.* 4.1.1 (SC 100:392–394) for a clear statement of this position.

53 That this is to be understood as testimony is noted by Mutschler (*Corpus Johanneum*, 125), who describes the quotations in *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:64–68) as “das Zeugnis des Heiligen Geistes in der Schrift.” Mutschler does not, however, attempt to distinguish the Spirit’s propological speech from its general inspiring function.

54 *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:66).

55 Cf. LSJ, s.v. σημαίνω.

verb δηλοῖ to describe the action of the Spirit with reference to the Son. This Greek verb (δηλώω), related to the adjective meaning “visible” or “conspicuous” (δῆλος), has a range of meanings, including “to make visible,” “to make clear,” and “to signify.”<sup>56</sup> Justin uses this term once in his writings, in which he describes the Scriptures that “declared” Christ to be Lord of hosts.<sup>57</sup> In the cases of both Justin and Irenaeus, then, the verb δηλώω appears to have to do with the Spirit’s action (in either a primary or secondary capacity) in testifying to the divinity of the Son. In these contexts, both σημαίνω and δηλώω appear to involve specific actions which seem to endow some degree of distinct personal identity on the subject of the verb. We can, therefore, add δηλώω (and, to a lesser extent, σημαίνω, which appears to be used more broadly) to θεολογέω and κυριολογέω as verbs that can, in the right context, get at the heart of what it means for the Spirit to provide Trinitarian testimony.

We also see in this passage that Irenaeus has brought in Gen 19:24 between the two quotations from the Psalter. Justin, we will recall, references this passage throughout *Dial.* 56, with the passages from the Psalter used as supporting evidence for his reading of Gen 19:24. The reason for this transposition of proof-texts is likely that Irenaeus is grouping together those quotations that speak of the Son as Lord (Ps 110:1; Gen 19:24) before turning to those quotations that make the subtly different point that the Son is God (Ps 45:6–7, 82:1).<sup>58</sup> Interestingly, as opposed to how Irenaeus interprets Ps 110:1 and Ps 45:6–7, the Spirit is not as explicitly identified as the speaker of Gen 19:24. At this point a more nuanced comparison with Justin is instructive. As we saw with Justin, this text is unusual insofar as it represents a rare instance of the Spirit providing Trinitarian testimony in its capacity as an inspiring secondary agent; still, Justin’s invocation of Gen 19:24 at the outset of *Dial.* 56.14 makes it reasonably clear that Justin intended to include this quotation as an example of the Spirit calling another “Lord.” In the case of Irenaeus, however, it is much less clear that this quotation is spoken by the Spirit; though the quotations around it are explicitly placed in the mouth of the Spirit, this quotation is simply introduced with the phrase, “Scripture says.” In context, though, we can assume that the Spirit is still standing behind this statement of Scripture, albeit as an inspiring secondary agent. In sum, then, the parallels with *Dial.* 56.14–15 are clear: the Spirit

56 Cf. LSJ, s.v. δηλώω; Lampe, s.v. δηλώω 1.

57 *Dial.* 85.1 (PTS 47:216).

58 So Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 68. As noted in the previous chapter of this book, the twofold testimony to the Son as both Lord and God may be an echo of Thomas’s confession in John 20:28.

testifies through the same three Old Testament passages to testify to the deity and lordship of both the Father and the Son.

It is precisely here, when Irenaeus wants to elaborate on how the Spirit identifies the Son as God, that he extends the scope of his proof-texts beyond what he likely derived from Justin:

And again, *God has stood in the congregation of the gods; he judges in the midst of the gods* [Ps 82:1 (LXX 81:1)]. It [the Spirit] is speaking (λέγει) of the Father and the Son and of those who have received adoption; those, however, are the Church, for she is the congregation of God, which God—that is, the Son—has assembled by himself. Of him again [the Spirit] says (λέγει), *The God of gods, the Lord has spoken and has summoned the earth* [Ps 50:1 (LXX 49:1)]. Which God? The one of whom it [the Spirit] has said (εἶπεν), *God will come manifestly, our God, and he will not keep silent* [Ps 50:3 (LXX 49:3)]. This is the Son, who came to human beings according to the manifestation, who says, *I have shown myself plainly to those who do not seek me* [Isa 65:1/Rom 10:20]. But of what gods [is he God]? [Of those] to whom he says, *I have said: You are gods and all sons of the Most High* [Ps 82:6 (LXX 81:6)]. Of those, of course, who have received the grace of adoption, by which *we cry, Abba, Father* [Rom 8:15].<sup>59</sup>

Irenaeus here begins by extending his argument with a series of quotations from the Psalter. None of these texts are dialogical, like Ps 110:1 and Ps 45:6–7; rather, these quotations all speak of God in the third person, as in the case of Gen 19:24. Moreover, whereas the previous set of quotations involved both the Father and the Son in some capacity, this group, as Irenaeus's interpretation of Ps 82:1 makes clear, involves not just the Father and the Son but additional divine beings as well. Still, we may note two important continuities with respect to Irenaeus's invocation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit.

First, these proof-texts are brought into Irenaeus's argument in service of the same claim that when Scripture refers to God, it only ever refers to the one true God, in whom the Son is included alongside the Father. The biblical texts that speak of at least two distinct divine persons (Ps 82:1 and Ps 50:1) must therefore be interpreted such that the Son is identified as a second divine person besides the Father. It is the Son, after all, whom Christians know from the *regula fidei* to be true God and who makes known the Father, a point which Irenaeus underscores through an appeal to Ps 50:3 and Isa 65:1. When still further divine

59 *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:67–69).

persons are brought in, as in the case of Ps 82:1 (“the gods”), they are interpreted as the members of the Church, who have been adopted as children of God, a claim which Irenaeus supports with an appeal to Ps 82:6 and Rom 8:15.<sup>60</sup>

Second, and more importantly for our argument, it is still the Spirit who stands behind these texts, albeit in a sense that diminishes its personhood in the divine theodrama. This matches what we saw with Justin; though the Spirit can testify to the divinity of other divine persons as either a primary speaking agent or as an inspiring secondary agent, it is generally the case that when the Spirit testifies in the latter capacity (in a non-dialogical text), the Spirit’s personhood is considerably diminished. We see the same phenomenon in this passage insofar as the Spirit is only the implied subject (there is no subject explicitly given in the text, and since the Spirit is the subject of the speaking verbs in the previous section, we may presume that the Spirit is still speaking) and as the verbs used are simply forms of λέγω rather than more active, personal verbs such as θεολογέω, κυριολογέω, σημαίνω, or δηλόω. We could, therefore, plausibly include these quotations as examples of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, albeit in a more diminished sense along the lines of what we have observed with Gen 19:24.

At this point in the argument, the Spirit fades from view entirely, with Irenaeus next considering texts spoken by the Father and the Son (3.6.2) and the Hebrew prophets (3.6.3) that he believes support his claim that Scripture only identifies the Father and the Son as God and Lord, before concluding with a brief prayer for his readers to grasp the truth of his argument (3.6.4).<sup>61</sup> Of the rest of this unit, *Haer.* 3.6.2 is of particular interest insofar as it extends the discussion of Trinitarian testimony:

Therefore, as I have said before, no one else is named “God” or called “Lord” except the one who is God and Lord of all things, who also said to Moses, *I am who I am*, and, *Thus you will say to the sons of Israel: He who is has sent me to you* [Exod 3:14]; and his Son is Jesus Christ our Lord, who makes those who believe in his name children of God. And again, when the Son speaks to Moses, he says, *I have come down to deliver this people*

60 Still, as Donovan (*One Right Reading?*, 68) clarifies, “these adopted ones are gods only derivatively and in a secondary sense.” This leads into the broader topic of deification in Irenaeus, for which see Ben C. Blackwell, *Christosis: Pauline Soteriology in Light of Deification in Irenaeus and Cyril of Alexandria*, WUNT 2/314 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 35–70, and especially 44–45 on the use of Ps 82 in *Haer.* 3.6.1.

61 Donovan (*One Right Reading?*, 69) describes this prayer as a “fiery plea” bringing this unit to a close.

[Exod 3:8], for it is he who descended and ascended for the salvation of human beings [cf. John 3:13]. Thus “He who is” has been manifested as God through the Son, who is in the Father and has in himself the Father [cf. John 17:21], the Father presenting testimony (*testimonium perhibente*; μαρτυρήσαντος) to the Son and the Son announcing (*adnuntiante*; καταγγείλαντος) the Father [cf. John 5:37; 17:26]. As also Isaiah says, *And I am a witness, says the Lord God, and the servant whom I have chosen, that you may know and believe and understand that I am* [Isa 43:10].<sup>62</sup>

In this section, thoroughly steeped in Johannine imagery and vocabulary, Irenaeus makes the particularly interesting claim that the Father is “presenting testimony to the Son” while the Son is “announcing the Father.” Both of these phrases are derived from John’s Gospel, with John 5:37 and 17:26 the most likely places from which Irenaeus derived these particular notions of the relationship between Father and Son.<sup>63</sup> The central question for our purposes is how this form of testimony relates to the intra-divine testimony that we have thus far marked as a distinctive function of the Spirit. Though these various testifying actions are no doubt related, I maintain that there are still some substantial differences between the Spirit’s intra-divine testimony, most clearly described in *Dial.* 56.14–15 and *Haer.* 3.6.1, and the testimony of the Father and the Son, described in John’s Gospel and *Haer.* 3.6.2.

This distinction is first made clear insofar as the verb that Irenaeus uses to refer to the Father’s action of speaking with respect to the Son (the Greek μαρτυρήσαντος, from μαρτυρέω, being the most likely basis for the Latin phrase *testimonium perhibente*) has a different nuance from the verbs used in the preceding passage to refer to the Spirit’s action in testifying to the Father and the Son. As noted in the previous chapter of this book, μαρτυρέω is a favorite verb of the Fourth Gospel, where it is used more than thirty times, often in

62 *Haer.* 3.6.2 (SC 211:68–70): Nemo igitur alius, quemadmodum praedixi, Deus nominatur aut Dominus appellatur nisi qui est omnium Deus et Dominus, qui et Moysi dixit: *Ego sum qui sum*, et: *Sic dices filiis Israel: Qui est misit me ad uos*, et huius Filius Iesus Christus Dominus noster, qui filios Dei facit credentes in nomen suum. Et iterum, Filio loquente ad Moysen: *Descendi*, inquit, *eripere populum hunc*. Ipse est enim qui descendit et ascendit propter salutem hominum. Per Filium itaque qui est in Patre et habet in se Patrem, is qui est manifestatus est Deus, Patre testimonium perhibente Filio et Filio adnuntiante Patrem. Quemadmodum et Esaias ait: *Et ego*, inquit, *testis, dicit Dominus Deus, et Puer quem elegi, uti cognoscatis et credatis et intellegatis quoniam ego sum*.

63 On the extensive utilization of the Johannine corpus in the writings of Irenaeus, see further Mutschler, *Corpus Johanneum*, *passim*.



connection with the Gospel's so-called trial motif. Here Irenaeus appears to be alluding to John 5:37, in which the Johannine Jesus argues that the Father "has testified" (μεμαρτύρηκεν) concerning him.<sup>64</sup> As elsewhere in the Johannine corpus, the nature of the testimony is simply focused upon "the nature and significance of [Jesus's] person."<sup>65</sup> With the Father's testimony concerning Jesus clearly directed towards human beings, this seems closer to the standard usage of the *topos* of divine testimony than what we are more narrowly defining as intra-divine testimony. Likewise, the verb that Irenaeus uses to refer to the Son's action of speaking with respect to the Father (the Greek καταγγέλλαντος, from καταγγέλλω, being the most likely basis for the Latin *adnuntiante*) centers upon the notion of "announcing."<sup>66</sup> Here Irenaeus is likely alluding to John 17:26, in which Jesus most clearly speaks of making known the Father.<sup>67</sup> The central meaning of these verbs, most probably derived from their Johannine context, again falls on the notion of revelation to human beings: the Son reveals the Father to the world, and the Father reveals the Son to the world.<sup>68</sup> This revelatory focus distinguishes these verbs from θεολογέω and its parallels, which instead center upon the notion of ascribing deity and lordship within the Godhead.

This somewhat subtle lexical distinction is supported by the even clearer distinction between the nature of the testimony being provided in each case. As we saw in the case of the Spirit, the Spirit's testimony serves to affirm the divinity and lordship of the Father and the Son. In the case of the testimony from the Father concerning the Son, Irenaeus offers as his proof-text Isa 43:10, a verse in which, according to a christological interpretation, the Father declares the Son

64 On John 5:37 and its surrounding context, see further Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John I–XII*, AB 29 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 222–230; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 vols. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 1:655–662.

65 Hermann Strathmann, "μάρτυς κτλ," *TDNT* 4:498.

66 Julius Schniewind, "καταγγέλλω κτλ," *TDNT* 1:70–72. This Greek verb is likely also behind the Latin *annuntiabant* as applied to the Son's actions (in concert with those of the apostles) with respect to the Father in *Haer.* 4.36.6 (SC 100:908), as well as behind the Latin *annuntiat* as applied to the action of the law with respect to the Father in *Haer.* 4.2.2 (SC 100:400).

67 While Irenaeus's tone is clearly Johannine, it is worth noting that the verb καταγγέλλω is not ever used in the Fourth Gospel; it is, rather, used only in Acts and in Paul. In John 17:26, the verb is γνωρίζω.

68 On John 17:26 and its surrounding context, see further Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John XIII–XXI*, AB 29A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970), 768–781; Keener, *John*, 2:1064.

to be his servant through whom he will make himself known.<sup>69</sup> Justin uses Isa 43:10 only once (*Dial.* 122.1) as part of a catena of Old Testament texts demonstrating that the Hebrew Scriptures looked ahead to the Gentiles as God's new people, and the verse is otherwise not quoted by any other Christian writer prior to Irenaeus. In both Justin and Irenaeus, the verse is quoted without any reference to prosopological exegesis or testimony directed to other divine persons, further demonstrating that the kind of testimony that Irenaeus has in mind in *Haer.* 3.6.2 concerning the Father and the Son is of a different sort than that in *Haer.* 3.6.1 concerning the Spirit. Indeed, when analyzing *Haer.* 3.6.2 as a whole, one is struck by the lack of any examples of intra-divine dialogue that might be used as evidence of the relationship between the Father and the Son. Irenaeus does, in fact, interpret certain dialogical Old Testament texts as from the persons of the Father and the Son (which we will consider in more detail in the next section of this chapter). This makes it all the more significant, therefore, that Irenaeus presents examples of intra-divine dialogue as the clearest instances of the intra-divine (and specifically Trinitarian) testimony of the Spirit even as he produces no such examples as evidence of the testimony from the Father or the Son that Irenaeus is describing in *Haer.* 3.6.2.

In sum, the kind of testimony that Irenaeus has in mind when he refers to the Father testifying to the Son (and, to an even lesser extent, the Son announcing the Father) is categorically different from that of the Spirit. In the former, the emphasis is on revelation; in the latter, the focus is on ascribing deity or lordship. Thus, we have demonstrated that the Spirit, in Irenaeus as in Justin, has a special role in testifying to the divinity and lordship of the Father and the Son. The thematic, lexical, and structural parallels between these two early Christian writers' presentation of the subject warrant the conclusion that Irenaeus was dependent on Justin for this particular argument. That makes it all the more significant, therefore, when Irenaeus deviates from Justin in his presentation of this theme.<sup>70</sup> For one thing, Irenaeus has translated this argument into an entirely new polemical context, aimed at the Gnostics and their method

69 Irenaeus's citation of Isa 43:10 follows the LXX against the MT by including the clause "and I am the witness" (καὶ γὰρ μάρτυς). Irenaeus also cites this form of Isa 43:10 as part of a broader quotation of Isa 43:10–12 in *Haer.* 4.5.1 (SC 100:426). Cf. Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition—Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*, NovTSup56 (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 449.

70 Cf. Lashier, *Irenaeus on the Trinity*, 26: "The strong trust and endorsement of Justin as an authentic interpreter of the apostles' words, both in Irenaeus's statements and in his practice, make the points at which Irenaeus departs from Justin even more significant for it implies he had a significant motive."

of biblical exegesis. For another, Irenaeus clarifies and expands our understanding of what it means for the Spirit to provide Trinitarian testimony through his expansion of the range of terms used to describe this action of the Spirit and through his contrast with other forms of testimony from the Father and the Son. As with Justin, we will next need to consider whether or not Irenaeus restricted this testifying role to the Spirit across all of his uses of prosopological exegesis.

### Differentiating Irenaeus's Use of Prosopological Exegesis

We have observed that Irenaeus in *Haer.* 3.6.1 gives the Spirit a unique role in speaking through Scripture to testify to the divinity and lordship of the Father and the Son, noting how this form of Trinitarian testimony differs from the kind of testimony provided by the other two persons of the Triune God. Like Justin, however, we now need to broaden our survey of Irenaeus's use of prosopological exegesis to compare the nature of the Old Testament quotations assigned to the Spirit with those that are assigned to the Father and the Son; likewise, we will need to consider the variety of types of quotations assigned to the Spirit. Only with a complete survey of Irenaeus's use of this ancient reading strategy can we say with confidence that Trinitarian testimony, or intra-divine testimony more broadly, is a function exclusively reserved for the Spirit.

As observed earlier in this chapter, Irenaeus seems to have a less inclusive understanding of what counts as prosopological exegesis relative to that of Justin. In particular, Irenaeus's understanding of prosopological exegesis, according to *Epid.* 49–50, appears to be limited to certain Old Testament texts featuring dialogue between divine persons, and the implications of this for each of the following sections of analysis will be explained in turn. We must also remember that Irenaeus, unlike Justin, does not give us a lengthy digression devoted to examples of the kinds of quotations spoken by the various divine persons; as such, the subsequent analysis will of necessity be devoted to identifying patterns across scattered instances of Irenaeus marking prosopological speech rather than proceeding consecutively through a large unit of text written for this exact purpose.

#### *Prosopological Exegesis from the Father*

In his introduction to prosopological exegesis (*Epid.* 49–50), Irenaeus noted in passing that the Spirit can speak from the person of the Father and provided examples of the Father thus speaking prosopologically to the Son (Ps 2:7–8, 110:1; Isa 49:6). As we seek to find and analyze other such examples of the Father's prosopological speech, we will limit ourselves to those that Irenaeus

interprets as instances of intra-divine dialogue, as it is only these that Irenaeus appears to mark as explicitly prosopological in nature. Irenaeus quotes extensively from the Old Testament and unsurprisingly simply assigns many instances of human-directed divine speech or prophecy to “God” (understood as the Father as opposed to the Son), but to the extent that these are not understood as instances of speech among or about other divine persons, we will set them aside as irrelevant for our study.<sup>71</sup> Accordingly, a search across all of Irenaeus’s writings for Old Testament quotations in which God or the Father is presented as the true speaker of a dialogical text involving other divine persons generates the following instances, summarized in Table 8 on the following page.

Surprisingly, there does not appear to be a single instance in which the Father speaks concerning the Son.<sup>72</sup> Rather, in each case, the Father is speaking to the Son in order to provide him with certain instructions, with clear echoes of Justin’s presentation of the same topic.<sup>73</sup> Thus, the Father instructs the Son to ask him for authority over the nations (Ps 2:8), to sit at his right hand until the nations have been subdued (Ps 110:b–c),<sup>74</sup> and to receive a commission to bring salvation to the nations (Isa 49:6). We thus see a common theme of the Father speaking concerning the Son’s reign over the nations of the world. Additionally, we again find the Father’s instructions to make humanity “in our

71 As noted in the previous chapter of this book, it is not even clear that such instances should be considered true prosopological exegesis in the first place insofar as they were already clearly marked as divine speech in their original textual settings. As previously, we will not consider quotations that are probably meant to be read as words of the Father to or about the Son or the Spirit but are not marked as such (i.e., they are presented just as the words of “Scripture” or of the prophet and it is only the content of the quotation itself that suggests such a reading); cf., e.g., *Haer.* 3.10.6, 3.12.1, 3.21.7, 4.14.1, 5.12.2 (SC 211:38, 178, 420; SC 100:542; SC 153:144–146); *Epid.* 43, 48, 62, 68, 85 (SC 406:146, 152, 174, 180–182, 198).

72 A comparison with the quotations that Justin interpreted as the Father speaking concerning the Son is instructive; Irenaeus does not ever quote, as Justin did, several of these texts (Deut 33:13–17; Ps 72:17; Isa 42:3, 51:4–5, 62:10–63:6). In other instances, texts which Justin interpreted in this way are simply quoted by Irenaeus without reference to a divine speaker; cf. Ps 110:3–4 at *Epid.* 48 (SC 406:152–154); Isa 57:1–2 at *Epid.* 72 (SC 406:184–186); Gen 49:10 at *Haer.* 4.10.2 (SC 100:494). In others, they are in fact assigned to another divine speaker; cf. Isa 57:1, which is assigned to the Son at *Haer.* 4.34.4 (SC 100:860).

73 For justification of this distinction between speaking “concerning” someone and speaking “to” someone, see Tertullian, *Prax.* 11.10 (FC 34:148) and the next chapter of this book.

74 A third instance of the Father speaking the words of Ps 110:1 to the Son, which could be added to the table above, is found in our key passage of *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:64), although in this instance the emphasis is on the Spirit reporting the words of the Father and as such I have decided not to include it again here.

TABLE 8 *Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to God/the Father in the writings of Irenaeus*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Haer.</i> 2.28.7 (SC 294:286)	Ps 110:1b–c (LXX 109:1b–c)	God	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Haer.</i> 4.pref.4 (SC 100:390)	Gen 1:26	God the Creator	gives instructions to the Son and Spirit (creation)
<i>Haer.</i> 4.20.1 (SC 100:626)	Gen 1:26	the Father	gives instructions to the Son and Spirit (creation)
<i>Haer.</i> 4.21.3 (SC 100:682)	Ps 2:8	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Haer.</i> 5.1.3 (SC 153:28)	Gen 1:26	the Father	gives instructions to the Son and Spirit (creation)
<i>Haer.</i> 5.15.4 (SC 153:210)	Gen 1:26	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (creation)
<i>Epid.</i> 49 (SC 406:154)	Isa 45:1	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Epid.</i> 49 (SC 406:154)	Ps 2:7b–8, 110:1b–c (LXX 109:1b–c)	the Father (as reported by the Son)	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Epid.</i> 50 (SC 406:156)	Isa 49:6	the Father (as reported by the Son)	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Epid.</i> 55 (SC 406:162)	Gen 1:26	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (creation)

image" (Gen 1:26).<sup>75</sup> Three out of the five times he quotes it, Irenaeus expounds this text as being spoken to the Spirit as well as to the Son; in each instance, the Spirit is portrayed along with the Son as the two hands of God, a theological insight he likely received from Theophilus's *To Autolytus*.<sup>76</sup>

This emphasis on Gen 1:26 and the doctrine of God as Creator makes a great deal of sense in the context of anti-Gnostic polemic; the question of how to

<sup>75</sup> On Irenaeus's use of Gen 1:26, see further Thomas Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus and Genesis: A Study of Competition in Early Christian Hermeneutics*, JTI Sup 1 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 104–144; Stephen O. Presley, *The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Irenaeus of Lyons*, BAC 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 135–137, 144–148, 176–180, 202–204.

<sup>76</sup> On this theme, see Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 104–126; John Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus* (London: Epworth, 1948), 119–139.

interpret the creation account(s) of Gen 1:1–2:3 indeed generated a lively debate in the second century across a wide range of early Christian texts, as both the Gnostic cosmogonies and the Irenaean response indicate.<sup>77</sup> Irenaeus is particularly concerned to show that creation is a unified action of Father, Son, and Spirit, and thus portraying the Father as instructing the Son and the Spirit in the act of creation provides a reading of the opening of Genesis consistent with this concern.<sup>78</sup> Irenaeus directly contrasts his interpretation of Gen 1:26 with that of the Gnostics, who appear to have read the plurality of divine beings in these verses as proof of their claims that creation was carried out by a host of angelic mediators; for Irenaeus, however, this plurality must exist within the Godhead, and not outside of it.<sup>79</sup> As Paul Blowers has demonstrated, this was not simply an academic dispute over cosmogony but rather an argument with meaningful implications for other aspects of doctrine, including fundamental questions of how to live in this world and the nature of the next life.<sup>80</sup> The implication of this theology of creation, Blowers contends, is that it “establish[es] the fundamental integrity of the created world from the outset, and within it the finite freedom of human beings whose nature is predisposed toward full communion with the Creator.”<sup>81</sup> As will be described in more detail below, this is a foundational principle undergirding Irenaeus’s understanding of the divine economy and the related notion of recapitulation.

In sum, with respect to his overall concerns in *Haer.*, Irenaeus has made a robust defense of the Father as the Creator God, with the Son (and indeed the Spirit) united to the Father, sharing a common will and activity, with special emphasis on the task of creation. To return to the task of differentiating Irenaeus’s use of prosopological exegesis, we must note that while Gen 1:26 is interpreted as a rare instance of intra-divine dialogue involving all three persons spoken by someone besides the Spirit, there is nevertheless a key difference insofar as the Father is not testifying to the other divine persons but rather instructing them to undertake the work of creation. In sum, then, when the Father speaks prosopologically through the words of the Old Testament, it is only to instruct one or both of the other divine persons; intra-divine testimony, much less Trinitarian testimony, is never in view.

77 Steenberg, *Irenaeus on Creation*, 61–62; Blowers (*Drama of the Divine Economy*, 84) notes that in the Nag Hammadi corpus there are some 200 quotations from Genesis 1–11.

78 Steenberg, *Irenaeus on Creation*, 62–71.

79 Steenberg, *Irenaeus on Creation*, 71–78; cf. *Haer.* 4.20.1 (SC 100:626).

80 Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy*, 81–82.

81 Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy*, 86.

### *Prosopological Exegesis from the Son*

In comparison to his predecessor Justin and his successor Tertullian, Irenaeus is far less explicit about his use of prosopological exegesis, and nowhere is this more evident than with respect to the Son. Irenaeus's brief introduction to prosopological exegesis (*Epid.* 49–50) includes three examples of the Son reporting the Father's speech to him (Ps 2:7–8, 110:1; Isa 49:5–6), though Irenaeus also alludes to how Christ says “other things through the prophets concerning himself.” Indeed much of the rest of *Epid.* will include such examples, but interestingly nowhere in his work does Irenaeus identify any other Old Testament passage as words spoken by the Son to the Father (or the Spirit, for that matter). We will set aside those instances of Old Testament divine speech that Irenaeus attributes to “Christ,” “the Lord,” or “the Word” that are interpreted as speech directed at human beings, or as concerning his incarnation and passion, but do not make mention of any other divine persons, again on the grounds that they are simply irrelevant for this study.<sup>82</sup> With this in mind, Table 9 on the following page gives all of the examples from the Irenaeian corpus that could satisfy Irenaeus's understanding of prosopological exegesis with respect to the second person of the Trinity.

In a curious inversion of the case of the Father, nowhere does the Son speak directly to the Father;<sup>83</sup> rather, in every instance above, the Son's intra-divine dialogue describes how the Father has worked with him over the course of his mission of redemption, with the Father anointing (Isa 61:1), commissioning (Ps 2:7a, 110:1a; Isa 49:5), and ultimately resurrecting (Ps 3:5) him. As in the case

82 Thus, we are excluding those instances in which the Word or the Son is identified as the speaker of various Old Testament passages that the Old Testament had merely identified as being the words spoken by “God” or “the Lord” to human beings; cf., e.g., to Moses at *Haer.* 3.6.2, 4.12.4, 4.20.9, 4.29.2 (SC 211:68–70; SC 100:518, 654, 768); *Epid.* 2, 9, 46 (SC 406:84–86, 96, 150); to Jeremiah at *Haer.* 5.15.3 (SC 153:206); to Adam at *Haer.* 5.15.4 (SC 153:210); to humans generally at *Haer.* 3.19.1, 4.36.5, 5.24.1 (SC 211:372; SC 100:900; SC 153:296); *Epid.* 45 (SC 406:148); to Abraham and others at *Epid.* 45–46 (SC 406:148–150). For instances in which the Son speaks of his coming ministry and passion, cf. *Haer.* 3.6.1, 4.34.4 (SC 211:68; SC 100:860); *Epid.* 34, 68, 79, 80, 82, 92 (SC 406:130 180, 192, 192–194, 194, 206). As usual, we will not consider quotations that are probably meant to be read as words of the Son to or about the Father but are not marked as such (i.e., they are presented just as the words of “Scripture” or of the prophet and it is only the content of the quotation itself that suggests such a reading); cf., e.g., *Haer.* 3.9.3, 3.17.1, 5.31.1 (SC 211:108–110, 328; SC 153:390).

83 The text which Justin identifies as the words of the Son to the Father, Ps 22:1–23, is only ever summarized and not presented as direct discourse in Irenaeus, as at *Haer.* 4.20.8, 4.33.12 (SC 100:652, 834), or simply introduced as the words of David, as at *Epid.* 79–80 (SC 406:192–194).

TABLE 9 *Intra-divine dialogue ascribed to Christ/the Son/the Word in the writings of Irenaeus*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Haer.</i> 3.18.3 (SC 211:350–352)	Isa 61:1	the Word	describes the Father's anointing
<i>Epid.</i> 49 (SC 406:154)	Ps 2:7a, 110:1a (LXX 109:1a)	Christ/the Son (introducing the words of the Father)	describes the Father's commissioning
<i>Epid.</i> 50 (SC 406:156)	Isa 49:5	Christ/the Son (introducing the words of the Father)	describes the Father's commissioning
<i>Epid.</i> 53 (SC 406:160)	Isa 61:1	Christ/the Word	describes the Father's anointing
<i>Epid.</i> 73 (SC 406:186)	Ps 3:5 (LXX 3:6)	the Spirit of Christ	describes the Father's work of resurrection

of the Father, none of these examples of prosopological speech from the Son make any reference to testimony in any capacity, and as such we can conclude that Irenaeus does not envision the Son providing intra-divine testimony.

### *Prosopological Exegesis from the Spirit*

This finally brings us to consider the instances in which Irenaeus presents the Spirit as the true speaker of a biblical text in its theodramatic setting. We must here acknowledge that in his overview of prosopological exegesis (*Epid.* 49–50), Irenaeus does not mention the Spirit speaking from its own person, and, unlike Justin, Irenaeus does not devote a section of his writings to the kinds of scriptural quotations spoken by the Spirit (cf. *1 Apol.* 39–45). Nevertheless, as seen in the case of *Haer.* 3.6.1, Irenaeus is in fact able to identify the Spirit as the primary speaking agent of certain biblical texts. Though Irenaeus's overview of prosopological exegesis appears to limit its use to situations in which there is dialogue among divine persons, for the sake of thoroughness we will here want to examine all instances of the Spirit being identified as the speaker, in at least some capacity, of a specific scriptural text, as summarized in Table 10 on the following page.<sup>84</sup>

84 On the Spirit as the inspiring secondary agent standing behind all of the Old Testament, see, e.g., *Haer.* 2.28.2, 4.11.1, 4.20.8, 4.33.1, 5.34.3 (SC 294:270; SC 100:496, 648, 802; SC 153:430); *Epid.* 26, 30, 67 (SC 406:120, 126, 178); for the Spirit's speech with respect to the New Testament, cf. *Haer.* 3.7.2, 3.16.2, 4.8.1 (SC 211:84, 294; SC 100:464).



TABLE 10 *Old Testament passages ascribed to the Spirit in the writings of Irenaeus*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Haer.</i> 2.34.3 (SC 294:358)	Ps 148:5–6, 21:4 (LXX 20:5)	the prophetic Spirit	testifies to the Father's work of creation and salvation
<i>Haer.</i> 3.6.1 (SC 211:64–68)	Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1), 45:6–7 (44:7–8), 82:1 (81:1), 50:1, 3 (49:1, 3); Gen 19:24	the Holy Spirit	Trinitarian testimony (Father and Son are Lord and God)
<i>Haer.</i> 3.6.5 (SC 211:80)	Num 12:7	the Spirit	testifies to Moses as servant of God
<i>Haer.</i> 3.10.4 (SC 211:128–130)	Ps 95:4–7 (LXX 94:4–7)	the Holy Spirit	testifies to God as Creator
<i>Haer.</i> 3.21.4 (SC 211:410–412)	Isa 7:10–17	the Holy Spirit	intra-divine testimony (the Son is God)
<i>Haer.</i> 4.2.4 (SC 100:402)	Isa 5:12	the Spirit	criticizes those who do not know God
<i>Haer.</i> 4.20.3 (SC 100:632)	Prov 8:22–25, 27–31	the Spirit (as Wisdom)	testifies to the Spirit's role in creation
<i>Haer.</i> 5.20.2 (SC 153:258)	Gen 2:16	the Spirit of God	speaks to Adam and Eve
<i>Epid.</i> 2 (SC 406:84)	Ps 1:1	the Spirit	criticizes those who do not know God
<i>Epid.</i> 8 (SC 406:94)	Various unclear/mixed citations	the Spirit	testifies to God as Creator

Interestingly, most of the examples of the Spirit's speech center upon the idea of testimony. This can take the form of the Spirit testifying (*testatur*) to how the Father created human beings and made provision for their salvation (Ps 21:4, 148:5–6) and to the Spirit's own role, as the Wisdom of God, in creation (Prov 8:22–31).<sup>85</sup> The Spirit also testifies concerning the identities of others.

85 Though after Irenaeus the Son, and not the Spirit, would come to be identified as the personified Wisdom of Prov 8:22–31, the later association of the Holy Spirit with the “spirit” in Gen 1:2 would allow for a rich exploration of the Spirit's role in creation; cf. Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy*, 113–118, 286–307. On the flexibility that some writers could

This can take place both with respect to human beings, as the Spirit names Moses a faithful minister and servant of God (Num 12:7),<sup>86</sup> as well as to divine beings: the Spirit calls (*vocatur*) the Father “Most High,” “Almighty,” and “Lord of Hosts” in order to identify the Father as the true Creator God at *Epid.* 8 (cf. *Haer.* 3.10.3). This of course fits within Irenaeus’s broader project of articulating, against the Gnostics, a particular theology of creation; just as Irenaeus reads Gen 1:26 as the words of the Father as the Creator God, so here biblical texts such as Ps 95:4–7 are brought in as the words of the Spirit to make this same point.<sup>87</sup> Finally, as we have already seen, the Spirit calls both the Father and the Son “Lord” and “God” at *Haer.* 3.6.1. Another example of this is found later in *Haer.* book 3, when Irenaeus portrays the Spirit as having “signified” (*significavit*), through the words of Isa 7:10–17, that the Son is God, marking this as an instance of intra-divine (but not Trinitarian) testimony.<sup>88</sup> The Spirit thus provides testimony to both Father and Son, and this takes place within what is apparently a broader function of the Spirit in correctly testifying to the identities of other beings, human and divine.

This section has thus demonstrated that, for Irenaeus as for Justin, the Spirit has a special role within the Trinity in testifying, as read through the theodramatic lens of prosopological exegesis, to the identities of the Father and the Son. If, however, Justin’s argument appeared to be limited to showing how the Spirit testifies to their deity and sovereignty, Irenaeus seems to go one step further by providing evidence of the Spirit testifying to the Father’s (as well as the Spirit’s own) role in creation. The identification of the true God with the Creator of the world is, of course, a central part of Irenaeus’s polemic against the Gnostics, again demonstrating how Irenaeus was capable of taking a particular method of reading the Old Testament from Justin concerning the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony and adapting it to a very different set of circumstances and opponents.

Before we can move on, however, we need to consider a further question about the uniqueness of the Spirit’s role in this regard. In contrast to Justin,

---

employ in identifying the speaker of Prov 8:22–31, see Abraham J. Malherbe, “The Holy Spirit in Athenagoras,” *JTS* 20 (1969): 538–542.

86 In *Epid.* 24 (SC 406:118), “God” is said to testify to Abraham “by the Holy Spirit.” This shows that, in the case of testimony concerning human beings such as Abraham and Moses, the Spirit’s testimony is simply an indication of God’s approval or disapproval of that person, distinguishing this as merely an instance of the standard *topos* of divine testimony.

87 In the words of Blowers (*Drama of the Divine Economy*, 12), “intertextual interpretation was the *sine qua non* of the theology of creation in the early church.”

88 *Haer.* 3.21.4 (SC 211:412).

Irenaeus also applies the language of testifying to the deity and sovereignty of the divine persons, in conjunction with language about speaking from one's own person, to the human authors of Scripture.<sup>89</sup> This dynamic is most clearly seen in three instances: one with reference to Luke (*Haer.* 3.10.5), one with reference to the Scriptures (*Haer.* 3.19.2), and one with reference to the apostles (*Haer.* 5.25.2). We will address each in turn to examine the relationship of these forms of testifying to that of the Spirit.

In the first case, Irenaeus is continuing the argument he began in *Haer.* 3.6.1 concerning the witness of Scripture to the one true God, here turning his focus to the evidence of the Evangelists.<sup>90</sup> When he arrives at his discussion of Luke's Gospel, Irenaeus cites Luke 2:22–24 and concludes that Luke “in his own person clearly calls [the Father] ‘Lord.’”<sup>91</sup> In the second case, Irenaeus is arguing from the Scriptures that the Son of God became incarnate, here focusing on how Jesus is both God and man.<sup>92</sup> It is in defense of the proposition that Jesus was divine that Irenaeus points back to *Haer.* 3.6.1, again noting that “we have demonstrated from the Scriptures that none of Adam's sons is according to himself absolutely called ‘God’ or named ‘Lord.’”<sup>93</sup> Finally, in the third case, Irenaeus is in the midst of a discussion of eschatology, with particular attention to the role of the Antichrist in the end times.<sup>94</sup> After making the point that Paul identified the Jerusalem Temple as belonging to the true God, Irenaeus explicitly points back to his earlier argument that “no one is called ‘God’ by the apostles speaking from their own persons, except him who is truly God, the Father of our Lord.”<sup>95</sup>

Setting the Latin of these various phrases beside the Latin of the key portion of *Haer.* 3.6.1, we can clearly see the similarities among these texts in Table 11 on the following page.

89 In Justin, only the Spirit is the explicit subject of these actions; see, for instance, *Dial.* 32.3, 33.2, 36.2, 37.2, 55.1, 56.3, 56.14, 56.15, 124.4 (PTS 47:122, 124, 130, 131, 159, 161, 164, 164, 285).

90 See further Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 70–75, for a discussion of the structure of this section of *Haer.*

91 *Haer.* 3.10.5 (SC 211:132): ex sua persona manifestissime Dominum appellans eum.

92 See further Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 84–87.

93 *Haer.* 3.19.2 (SC 211:376): nemo in totum ex filiis Adae Deus appellatur secundum eum aut Dominus nominatur, ex Scripturis demonstrauiamus.

94 See further Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 163–166.

95 *Haer.* 5.25.2 (SC 153:312): nullum ab Apostolis ex sua persona Deum appellari nisi eum qui vere sit Deus.

TABLE 11 *Comparison of Haer. 3.6.1 with related passages*

Passage	Latin
<i>Haer.</i> 3.6.1 (SC 211:64)	... neque <b>Dominum appellassent</b> aliquem <b>ex sua persona</b> nisi qui dominatur omnium Deum Patrem ...
<i>Haer.</i> 3.10.5 (SC 211:132)	... <b>ex sua persona</b> manifestissime <b>Dominum appellans</b> eum qui legislationem fecerit.
<i>Haer.</i> 3.19.2 (SC 211:376)	... nemo in totum ex filiis Adae <b>Deus appellatur</b> secundum eum at <b>Dominus</b> nominatur, ex Scripturis demonstrauimus.
<i>Haer.</i> 5.25.2 (SC 153:312)	... nullum ab Apostolis <b>ex sua persona Deum appellari</b> nisi eum qui vere sit Deus ...

Thus, just as Irenaeus uses the language of *ex sua persona* (ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου προσώπου) and the verb *appello* with the predicates *Deus* (θεολογέω) or *Dominus* (κυριολογέω) to describe the action of the Spirit in testifying to the divinity and lordship of the Father and the Son, so also does he use the same key words in describing how the apostolic writers of the New Testament testified to the divinity and lordship of the Father.<sup>96</sup> Clearly, there is a significant overlap between the testimony of the Spirit and the testimony of the apostolic witness as found in Scripture; the language is too similar (and too rare across all of Irenaeus's writings) to be a mere coincidence.

What, then, does this mean for the uniqueness of the Spirit's intra-divine testimony? In the case of Justin, the language of calling a divine person "Lord" and "God" was exclusively reserved for the Spirit. While Irenaeus has indeed expanded his usage of these terms relative to Justin, the Spirit's uniqueness is nevertheless preserved insofar as the prophets, the Scriptures, and the Evangelists who testify to the deity and lordship of the Father or the Son do so *by means of the Spirit* insofar as the Spirit stands behind the Scriptures and their human authors. Justin seems to have paved the way for this move by including in *Dial.* 56.14 the claim that the Spirit testified through narrative description (Gen 19:24) concerning the deity and sovereignty of the Father and the Son. Irenaeus has simply extended this notion of the Spirit providing intra-divine testimony through Scripture more broadly (and not exclusively through intra-

96 To be more precise, as the table above indicates, *Haer.* 3.10.5 (SC 211:132) and 5.25.2 (SC 153:312) include all of the key words from 3.6.1 (SC 211:64), whereas 3.19.2 (SC 211:376) includes the verb *appello* but not the language of *ex sua persona*.

divine dialogue); even when the Spirit is not explicitly referenced, there is no doubt that Irenaeus understands the Spirit to be the ultimate voice behind all of the words of Scripture. Given Irenaeus's interest in promoting apostolic succession and the harmony between the teaching of the apostles and the teaching of his own churches,<sup>97</sup> it is not surprising that when he turns his focus to the New Testament he places the spotlight more on the apostles than on the Spirit, even if the Spirit is the ultimate means by which the apostles testify.

There is, however, one other potential challenge to the exclusivity of the Spirit in providing intra-divine testimony. In *Haer.* 3.9.1, Irenaeus places Christ alongside the prophets and the apostles as witnesses to the one true God. As he begins his presentation of the evidence from the Gospels, Irenaeus frames his discussion with the following contention:

Neither the prophets nor the apostles nor Christ the Lord from his own person (*ex sua persona*) confessed (*confessum*) any other as "Lord" or "God" but the one who is preeminently God and Lord, with the prophets and the apostles acknowledging (*confitentibus*) the Father and the Son, but not naming (*nominantibus*) another as "God" nor acknowledging (*confitentibus*) another as "Lord," and with the Lord himself handing down to the disciples only the Father as "God" and "Lord," him who is the only God and ruler of all things.<sup>98</sup>

Here we have Christ placed alongside the prophets and the apostles as witnesses to the identity of the one true God. The language of *ex sua persona* and the context of identifying true God and true Lord alert us to the fact that we have yet another parallel to *Haer.* 3.6.1. That being said, there is a key lexical difference in this passage: the verb used here is not *appello*, but rather *confiteor*. This verb, meaning "to confess," was almost certainly *ὁμολογέω* in Irenaeus's original Greek, and as such we need to distinguish its nuances from that of *κυριολογέω* or *θεολογέω*. The verb *ὁμολογέω* is often used in early Christian writings in either a legal ("to bear witness") or a liturgical ("to confess something in

97 See again *Haer.* 3.1–4 (SC 211:20–52).

98 *Haer.* 3.9.1 (SC 211:98): *neminem alterum Dominum uel Deum neque prophetas neque apostolos neque Dominum Christum confessum esse ex sua persona sed praecipue Deum et Dominum, prophetis quidem et apostolis Patrem et Filium confitentibus, alterum autem neminem neque Deum nominantibus neque Dominum confitentibus, et ipso Domino Patrem tantum Deum et Dominum eum qui solus Deus est et dominator omnium tradente discipulis.*

faith”) sense, although in both cases there is almost always a clear conceptual link with notions of faith and judgment; to confess Christ as “Lord” and “God” arises out of faith and results in eschatological salvation.<sup>99</sup> Though the New Testament never uses this verb to describe an action of Christ with respect to the identity of the Father as God, it is nevertheless the case that Jesus, in his humanity, modeled faith and worship in the Creator God of Israel alone and looked to him for eschatological vindication.

We are left, then, with a slightly different form of witness or testimony than appears to be the case with the Spirit. Again, there is no question that the verb ὁμολογέω has some overlap in meaning with the verbs κυριολογέω or θεολογέω (as well as the related verbs μαρτυρέω or καταγγέλλω, encountered earlier in *Haer.* 3.6.2). Still, there appears to be a real difference between how the Spirit’s testimony, as an extension of the *topos* of divine testimony, centers on how a divine being calls another being divine and how Christ, at the time of the incarnation, taught his disciples about true worship. This interpretation is supported by a related passage in which Irenaeus writes how “our Lord Jesus Christ confesses (*confitetur*) this same being as his Father, where he says: *I confess (confiteor) you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth*” (*Haer.* 4.2.2).<sup>100</sup> This quotation of Matthew 11:25/Luke 10:21 is interesting because the verb used by the Evangelists, here translated “confess” (but perhaps better translated as “praise” or “thank”), is ἐξομολογέω, which is even more explicitly the language of cultic worship than it is the language of the courtroom.<sup>101</sup> As such, it seems most likely that Irenaeus’s understanding of the Son’s confession of the Father has more to do with the context of worship than it does the context of testimony.<sup>102</sup>

99 Cf. Otto Michel, “ὁμολογέω κτλ.,” *TDNT* 5:199–220.

100 *Haer.* 4.2.2 (SC 100:398): Dominus noster Jesus Christus eundem hunc Patrem suum confitetur in eo quod dicit: *Confiteor tibi, Pater, Domine caeli et terrae.*

101 See Michel, *TDNT* 5:213–214. See also *Haer.* 4.9.3 (SC 100:491) for a further instance of Jesus as the subject of the verb ὁμολογέω.

102 I understand the difficult passage in *Epid.* 84 (SC 406:196), in which Irenaeus interprets Ps 24:8, to be functioning in the same way. Whereas Justin in *Dial.* 36.6 (PTS 47:131) was unclear whether this should be identified as the words of the Father or of the Spirit, Irenaeus simply assigns the words to a lower group of angelic beings, employing the word *testantur* to describe the action of the lower angels to the Son at the time of his ascension. Like the Son’s testimony in *Haer.* 3.9.1 (SC 211:98), the emphasis appears to be on a call to worship in light of the psalm’s enthronement motif, with the lower angels pointing out to the higher ones that Jesus is in fact the incarnate Word who had previously descended to the earth. Again, there is certainly overlap with the Spirit’s Trinitarian testimony, but there are still differences in emphasis. Irenaeus’s ordering and ranking of the spirit world,

Therefore, we may conclude that Irenaeus, like Justin, intended to cast the Spirit in the unique role of providing intra-divine or even Trinitarian testimony. Indeed, though there is a greater unity in the way in which the various members of the Godhead testify to one another, we can be more precise in saying that while the Father directs his testimony concerning the nature of Christ's person and work to human beings, and while the Son's testimony involves proclaiming the Father to humankind and confessing the Father as Lord in a liturgical context, the Spirit's testimony uniquely involves ascribing divinity and lordship to the Father and the Son. More narrowly, we have seen again that when the Spirit is identified as the primary speaking agent of a biblical text, its testimony is exclusively directed within the Godhead, a phenomenon which we do not encounter with any other instances of prosopological exegesis in the writings of Irenaeus.

### Historical-Theological Context: The Testimony of the Spirit in the Divine Economy

As we have seen, Irenaeus follows Justin in connecting the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit with the Spirit's prosopological speech. However, Irenaeus, in contrast to Justin, sets out a thorough, highly refined presentation of his pneumatology that sheds additional light on his understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. As such, in this section we will analyze how the Spirit's testifying function fits within Irenaeus's broader pneumatology as anchored within his portrayal of the divine economy. We will, however, have to be sensitive throughout this section to the particular historical circumstances that may have stimulated this theological development. Like Justin, Irenaeus was a participant in the complex process of early Christian self-definition, a process that involved constructing boundaries between groups that otherwise shared a number of similar beliefs and practices. As such we must be attentive to the role that Irenaeus's debate with Gnosticism played in the development of his view of the Spirit, much less of God more broadly.<sup>103</sup> Thus, by the end of this section, we hope to yield a new understanding of the extent to which

---

here characterized by his distinction between the lower and higher groups of angels, calls to mind similar projects among Platonists and Gnostics; cf. Marx-Wolf, *Spiritual Taxonomies*, 38–70.

103 The notion that Gnostic texts actually spurred on the development of proto-orthodox theology has been developed by, e.g., Marx-Wolf, *Spiritual Taxonomies*, 71–99.

Gnostic ideas may have influenced relevant aspects of Irenaeus's pneumatology, suggesting a more complicated view of the origins of "orthodox" Christian theology.

### *Irenaeus and the Divine Economy*

Irenaeus's theological ambitions transcended the articulation of an anti-Gnostic doctrine of creation; rather, he sought to put forward a comprehensive theology of the entire sweep of God's plan of providing salvation—including, ultimately, deification—to human beings. This broader notion of the divine "economy" (οἰκονομία; *dispensatio*) is central to Irenaeus's theology, and requires our brief attention. Whatever its precise origins, this term is used frequently by Roman rhetoricians to describe the manner in which the parts of a work are arranged in order to substantiate its overall "hypothesis" (*argumentum*; ὑπόθεσις); thus, Irenaeus can use forms of this term to charge the Gnostics with misunderstanding the "economy" of Scripture.<sup>104</sup> By extension, this term was also used outside of the literary sphere to refer to the management of a household or a city, as well as other forms of "good administration" or "purposeful arrangement."<sup>105</sup> Applied to God in the context of Christian theology, then, it generally refers to God's plan of salvation for the human race.<sup>106</sup> Though the term is found in Christian literature with this sense prior to Irenaeus,<sup>107</sup> the bishop of Lyons develops it to a greater extent than any of his predecessors.<sup>108</sup> God, according to Irenaeus, is like a wise architect who is drawing up the

104 Briggman, "Literary and Rhetorical Theory," 517–523; cf. προσοικειοῦν at *Haer.* 1.8.2 (SC 264:117) and συνοικειοῦν at *Haer.* 1.10.3 (SC 264:162). See also Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 49–50.

105 Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 74.

106 Cf. Lampe, s.v. οἰκονομία C3; Otto Michel, "οἰκονομία," *TDNT* 5:151–153; Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 79. For a comprehensive introduction to the historical backgrounds of the term and its application in early Christianity, see Jacques Fantino, *La théologie d'Irénée: Lecture des Écritures en réponse à l'exégèse gnostique: Une approche trinitaire* (Paris: Cerf, 1994), 85–126.

107 See, e.g., Eph 1:10, 3:9; Ignatius, *Eph.* 18.2, 20.1 (LCL 24:236, 238); Justin, *Dial.* 30.3, 31.1, 45.4, 87.5, 103.3, 120.1 (PTS 47:118, 118, 144, 222, 247, 276). All of these texts have some relationship to Ephesus, suggesting the possibility that this notion of the divine economy was first developed in that city.

108 As John Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*, OECs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 33, puts it, "While earlier writers, both Christian and Gnostic, as well as Irenaeus, had used the term 'economy' or 'economies' to describe particular salvific acts of God, such as the Incarnation or the passion, it seems probable that it was Irenaeus who first used the term in a singular universal sense, bringing together all the various



blueprints for salvation.<sup>109</sup> For Irenaeus, this divine economy has been revealed to human beings through the Scriptures; once one has a correct understanding of the basic Christian story as summarized in the *regula fidei*, one will be able to trace what Blowers summarizes as “God’s overarching arrangement in divulging [his] truth through a trinitarian or christocentric plot,” and thus discern the strategy of God’s work in creation and redemption through each stage of God’s relationship with humankind.<sup>110</sup> In other words, if the *regula fidei* gives the content of the Christian narrative, the economy refers to the manner or sequence in which the plot of that narrative is arranged. A correct understanding of the divine economy, Irenaeus takes great pains to demonstrate, is essential for reading the Scriptures in accordance with their true hypothesis, as summarized in the *regula fidei*.<sup>111</sup> This economy reaches its grand climax in Christ, whose life, death, and resurrection are a “recapitulation” (*recapitulatio*; ἀνακεφαλαιώσις), or a culmination in his own person, of the entire divine economy.<sup>112</sup>

As with Irenaeus’s theology of creation, his development of his understanding of the divine economy did not occur in a vacuum but rather in dialogue with the Gnostic theologies his writings sought to refute. The Gnostics, we recall, offered not just a set of beliefs concerning the creation of the world but an entire perspective on the nature, purpose, and destiny of human beings in light of their understanding of the world’s origins.<sup>113</sup> Irenaeus’s articulation of what he believes to be the correct understanding of the divine economy is therefore in direct opposition to what Blowers characterizes as the Gnostics’ “compelling

---

aspects of this relationship into one all-embracing divine plan or economy.” This term is also found in Gnostic writings, as at *Tri. Trac.* (NHC I,5) 95.8.

109 *Haer.* 4.14.2 (SC 100:544).

110 Blowers, “*Regula Fidei*,” 210. As Bates (*Birth*, 186) puts it, “If the hypothesis is the master plan for a whole literary work, then the economies are the bounds and the sequencing of the specific elements by which that master plan actually unfolds.”

111 For more on Irenaeus’s general view of the divine economy, see further Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 74–94; Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology*, 34–85; Fantino, *Théologie d’Irénée*, 203–382. On the close relation between Irenaeus’s conceptions of the hypothesis of Scripture and the *regula fidei*, see Briggman, “Literary and Rhetorical Theory,” 508 n. 33, demonstrating some of the difficulty that many scholars have had in distinguishing between these two key concepts.

112 See *Haer.* 1.10.1 (SC 264:156); on Irenaeus’s view of recapitulation, see further Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 97–140; Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology*, 62–65; Fantino, *Théologie d’Irénée*, 240–264; Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy*, 87–90.

113 See again Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy*, 81–82, 98.

mythical frameworks for imagining the plight of soul and body in the material world and beyond.”<sup>114</sup> Against the Gnostics’ belief in a demiurge who created the world apart from the will of the one true God, Irenaeus’s understanding of the divine economy focuses on tracing the unity of God’s actions in Christ with respect to human beings, showing a single divine purpose throughout history and the different covenants or dispensations that negotiated God’s relationship with his creatures.<sup>115</sup> The specific details of the unfolding of the divine economy are set out in a relatively clear and systematic fashion in *Epid.*,<sup>116</sup> but Irenaeus makes several important points concerning the economy in *Haer.* One of the most significant of these involves the purpose of the economy, which Irenaeus sets out in *Haer.* 4.14.1:

Therefore, in the beginning, it was not as if God, needing a human being, formed Adam, but rather so that he might have [someone] on whom he might bestow his benefits. For not only before Adam, but also before all creation, the Word was glorifying his Father, remaining in him, and was himself praised by the Father. [...] For, then, as *wherever there is a carcass, there also the eagles will be gathered together* [Matt 24:28], participating in the glory of the Lord who has both formed us and prepared us for this, that when we are with him, we may participate in his glory.<sup>117</sup>

Drawing on Johannine imagery,<sup>118</sup> Irenaeus suggests that the purpose of the economy is nothing less than God granting human beings the opportunity to share in the glory of God; it is, as Irenaeus says elsewhere, for “the unification and communion of God and human beings.”<sup>119</sup> This is accomplished, according

<sup>114</sup> Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy*, 82.

<sup>115</sup> Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology*, 33; Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy*, 86.

<sup>116</sup> See especially *Epid.* 17–42 (SC 406:104–144).

<sup>117</sup> *Haer.* 4.14.1 (SC 100:538–542): Igitur initio, non quasi indigens Deus hominis, plasmavit Adam, sed ut haberet in quem collocaret sua beneficia. Non enim solum ante Adam, sed et ante omnem conditionem glorificabat Verbum Patrem suum, manens in eo, et ipse a Patre clarificabatur [...]. Hoc ideo quoniam *ubicumque est cadaver, illuc congregantur et aquilae*, participantes gloriae Domini: qui et formavit et ad hoc praeparavit nos, ut dum sumus cum eo participemus gloriae ejus. On this passage, see further Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 201–202; Fantino, *Théologie d'Irénée*, 204.

<sup>118</sup> On the mutual glorification of the Father and the Son, cf. John 13:31–32, 17:4–5. On the Son remaining in the Father, see John 15:4–10.

<sup>119</sup> *Haer.* 5.1.1 (SC 153:20): adunionem et communionem Dei et hominum. See also *Haer.* 4.38.4 (SC 100:956–960).

to Irenaeus, primarily through the Son's recapitulation of the divine economy, which reconstitutes humanity in a new, perfected form.<sup>120</sup> The Son, in other words, invites his disciples to share with him in the work of glorifying the Father, a work which belonged to him even before the creation of the world. All of God's dealings with human beings, therefore, must be understood in the correct sequence by which God is moving humankind ever closer to participation in his own divine life.

### *Irenaeus and the Testimony of the Spirit in the Divine Economy*

Though Irenaeus's understanding of the divine economy centers on the work of the Son in recapitulation, the Spirit also plays an essential role in what is ultimately an operation of the entire Trinity in saving and deifying human beings. As scholars have demonstrated, the primary, overarching role of the Spirit in the divine economy is to bring life to human beings, encompassing both animation in this life and vivification in the next.<sup>121</sup> Indeed, just as the Spirit raised Christ from the dead to share in the immortality of God, so also the Spirit will raise the followers of Christ, who presently possess the Spirit only in part, to share in the fullness of the divine life.<sup>122</sup> Here we are particularly interested in the Spirit's work of preparing humanity in this life for vivification in the next, as Irenaeus suggests that one aspect of this work of the Spirit is to reveal the divine economy to human beings. This ministry of the Spirit is made most clear in *Haer.* 4.33.7, a key passage that warrants our careful examination.

In terms of its broader context, *Haer.* 4.20–35 is concerned with demonstrating the harmony of the Old and New Testaments, as evidenced by how the former prophesies the latter.<sup>123</sup> Within this, *Haer.* 4.33 is a single unit; Irenaeus three times in this chapter quotes 1 Cor 2:15, repeating the refrain that a true “spiritual disciple” (*discipulus spiritalis*) is one who “indeed judges all, but is judged by none” (*judicat quidem omnes, ipse autem a nemine judicatur*).<sup>124</sup> This threefold repetition creates a chiastic structure to the chapter, with Irenaeus's depiction of the Spirit as the one who provides knowledge of the truth

120 Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 97; cf. Fantino, *Théologie d'Irénée*, 205–220.

121 See further Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology*, 86–115; Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 148–181; Holsinger-Friesen, *Irenaeus and Genesis*, 164–174.

122 See further Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology*, 109.

123 On the structure and argument of *Haer.* 4.20–35 (SC 100:624–876), see Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 115–128.

124 See especially *Haer.* 4.33.1, 7, 15 (SC 100:802, 818, 844); cf. 1 Cor 2:15. This form of the citation is from *Haer.* 4.33.1.

and of the divine economy at the center.<sup>125</sup> In this key central unit, Irenaeus introduces what specifically a true spiritual disciple believes with the following words:

For all things are evident to him: a complete faith in one God Almighty, from whom are all things [...] and in the Spirit of God, who furnishes the knowledge of the truth (*agnitionem veritatis*) and who has made known the economies (*dispensationes*) of the Father and the Son according to which he was present for the human race in every generation, as the Father wills.<sup>126</sup>

In his description of what the true spiritual disciple believes concerning the Spirit, Irenaeus describes the Spirit as the divine being who provides Christians with two important and related things: knowledge of the truth and knowledge of the economies of the Father and the Son; we will examine each of these concepts in turn.

---

125 Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 125. Specifically, in *Haer.* 4.33.1–7a (SC 100:802–816), Irenaeus attacks, besides the Valentinians, the Marcionites, the Ebionites, and perhaps even the Montanists (see below). In *Haer.* 4.33.7b–9 (SC 100:818–822), Irenaeus presents the content of the “true knowledge” (*agnitio vera*) held by these disciples. Finally, *Haer.* 4.33.10–15 (SC 100:822–846) provides specific illustrations. Irenaeus’s likely reference to what would come to be termed Montanism at *Haer.* 4.33.6 (SC 100:814) is significant in light of the Montanist inclinations of Tertullian, the subject of the following chapter of this book. In this section, Irenaeus goes on the offensive against a group known for practicing ecstatic prophecy, which several scholars have identified as a reference to the Montanists; cf. Hitchcock, *Irenaeus of Lugdunum*, 6; Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 6; Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 115–116. While it is possible that Irenaeus is claiming that the role of the Spirit is not to provide some private revelation of God to an individual through ecstatic prophecy but to testify through the Scriptures concerning the truth of God, it is also conceivable that Irenaeus’s problem with the Montanists is not so much with prophecy in general as it is with prophecy that leads to divisiveness and schism; cf. Grant, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 6; Ronald E. Heine, “The Role of the Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy,” *SecCent* 6 (1987): 1–19, here 14–15. See also Eusebius’s mention at *Hist. eccl.* 5.3.4 (SC 41:27) of the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons to the church at Rome concerning the Montanist controversy. In any event, it is clear that Irenaeus contrasts the true prophetic work of the Spirit in glorifying the Father and the Son with the false prophetic work of the Spirit in glorifying the prophet himself.

126 *Haer.* 4.33.7b (SC 100:818): *Omnia enim ei constant: et in unum Deum onnipotentem, ex quo omnia, fides integra [...] est in Spiritu Dei, qui praestat agnitionem veritatis, qui dispositiones Patris et Filii exposuit secundum quas aderat generi humano, quemadmodum vult Pater.*

First, Irenaeus presents the Spirit as one who leads Christians into truth. As noted in the previous chapter of this book, the notion of the Spirit as truth is a distinctively, although by no means exclusively, Johannine theme. Even more explicitly than Justin, Irenaeus quotes directly from the Johannine writings, even stating at one point that “the Spirit is truth” (cf. 1 John 5:6).<sup>127</sup> That the Spirit leads Christians into a knowledge of the truth is a clear echo of John 16:13, in which the Johannine Jesus tells his disciples, “when the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth.”<sup>128</sup> The phrase “knowledge of the truth” (ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας) is found in the later New Testament writings, often in the context of describing the fundamental truths about the Christian faith by which one can be saved.<sup>129</sup> Irenaeus seems to be most conspicuously echoing 1 Tim 2:4, in which the content of this truth is spelled out in the following verses (2:5–6) as belief in the one God and in his mediator, Jesus Christ, which brings us to the related second half of Irenaeus’s argument in this portion of *Haer.* 4.33.7.<sup>130</sup> In Irenaeus’s particular context, this “truth” most plausibly refers to a correct understanding of the divine economy as summarized in the *regula fidei*, which is indeed precisely where Irenaeus now takes this argument.

Second, Irenaeus describes the Spirit as one who has set forth the economies of the Father and the Son. As indicated in the original Greek, here preserved in a fragment by John of Damascus, the Latin *dispositio* is a translation of the Greek οἰκονομία, the word that is, as we saw above, so central to Irenaeus’s theology.<sup>131</sup>

127 *Haer.* 3.24.1 (SC 211:474); cf. *Haer.* 4.35.2 (SC 100:864–866). Also unlike Justin, Irenaeus makes explicit use of the Johannine corpus, referencing John’s Gospel and its description of the Paraclete in *Haer.* 3.11.9 (SC 211:172); cf. *Haer.* 3.17.2–3 (SC 211:330–336). Johannine imagery portraying the Spirit as the Paraclete can be found in the Nag Hammadi codices in *Pr. Paul* (NHC I,1) A.17, suggesting that perhaps Irenaeus’s Gnostic opponents might have also been familiar with this view of the Spirit.

128 John 16:13a (NA28:356; trans. NRSV): ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ. On Irenaeus’s use of the Fourth Gospel, see Kyle Keefer, *The Branches of the Gospel of John: The Reception of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*, LNTS 332 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 44–63.

129 See 1 Tim 2:4; 2 Tim 2:25, 3:7; Titus 1:1; Heb 10:26. In the Pastoral Epistles, “truth” refers to the authoritative revelation from God; cf. Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 179. For the polemic use of this term in the struggle for early Christian self-definition, see further Jesse Sell, *The Knowledge of the Truth—Two Doctrines: The Book of Thomas the Contender (CG 11,7) and the False Teachers in the Pastoral Epistles*, EUS 23/194 (Frankfurt: Lang, 1982).

130 On the details of the content of this truth, see Towner, *Letters to Timothy and Titus*, 179–186.

131 See the edition of Rousseau at *Haer.* 4.33.7 (SC 100:816–818) for details on this Greek frag-

Here we notice that the term is used in the plural, which Eric Osborn notes is generally used to refer to the various manifestations of the Word in the Old Testament.<sup>132</sup> In this context, however, which speaks of both the Father and the Son, the emphasis seems to be on how the Spirit reveals the same God (“a complete faith in *one* God Almighty”) in every dispensation of the economy (that is, in every step of God’s saving plan). In other words, the true spiritual disciple, because of the Spirit, knows the truth that there has always only been one God and one Word.<sup>133</sup>

This represents something of an extension of Justin’s understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. For Justin, the communication of this testimony to human beings was only implicit and indirect, insofar as the Spirit’s words were recorded in the pages of Scripture; it is as if human beings are able to eavesdrop on the divine theodrama to hear the Spirit’s testimony. For Irenaeus, however, the Spirit’s role in presenting this testimony to human beings is more explicit and direct; it is more like the Spirit actively instructs human beings on the nature of the divine economy, with the Spirit’s own testimony to the deity and lordship of the other divine persons, as recorded in Scripture, as its primary evidence. As such, Irenaeus’s presentation of the Spirit’s revelation of the divine economy refines Justin’s understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit by making more explicit the Spirit’s role in communicating its own testimony concerning the Father and the Son to human beings through what Irenaeus describes as the revelation of the divine economy. To return to the above point, therefore, the truth to which the Spirit testifies is meant to be understood as knowledge of the divine economy.<sup>134</sup>

---

ment, which reads as follows: Πάντα συνέστηκεν· εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν παντοκράτορα ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα πίστις ὁλόκληρος [...] ἡ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ τὰς οἰκονομίας Πατρός τε καὶ Υἱοῦ σκηνοβατοῦν καθ’ ἐκάστην γενεάν εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καθὼς βούλεται ὁ Πατήρ. Briggman (*Irenaeus of Lyons*, 154–155) points out a translation problem insofar as the Greek text contains one verb (σκηνοβατοῦν), whereas the Latin contains two (*exponere* and *adesse*). Following Briggman, this is best solved by assuming that the Latin translator was unable to decide between the two meanings of σκηνοβατοῦν and thus used the two verbs in Latin that best fit its contextual meaning (“to make known”) and its literal meaning (“to dwell”); in context, “to make known” makes more sense than “to dwell.”

132 Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 78.

133 Cf. Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 155; Irenaeus spells this out more clearly just a few paragraphs later at *Haer.* 4.33.15 (SC 100:842–846). Cf. John 1:1–2.

134 As argued by Antonio Orbe, *Traducción y Comentario del Libro IV del “Adversus Haereses”*, vol. 4 of *Teología de San Ireneo*, Biblioteca de Autores Christianos (Madrid: Estudio Teológico de San Ildefonso de Toledo, 1985), 460 n. 28: “En virtud del Espíritu de Dios llega el ‘espiritual’ al conocimiento perfecto de la Verdad, que tiene por peculiar objeto las ‘dis-

Irenaeus further refines his presentation of why the Spirit communicates its Trinitarian testimony to human beings through his understanding of the ultimate purpose of the divine economy. As seen in *Haer.* 4.14.1, Irenaeus suggests that the goal of the economy is to extend to humankind the vision of and participation in the life of the Triune God. The Spirit, as noted, has the distinctive role of preparing humankind for eschatological vivification, and part of this role of preparation is to instruct human beings in the mysteries of the divine economy.<sup>135</sup> It is within this ministry of the Spirit that the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony makes a great deal of sense. The Spirit's testimony to another divine person concerning another divine person is a unique glimpse into the divine life of the Trinity, the exact same life for which the Spirit is preparing humankind to share.<sup>136</sup> The Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, therefore, is a natural outgrowth of the Spirit's role in revealing the divine economy in order to prepare humankind to share in the Trinitarian life of the Godhead. In sum, by enabling people to have a deeper understanding of God through its revelation of the divine economy, the Spirit is in a sense bringing them closer into the presence of God.<sup>137</sup>

An analysis of the influence of Gnosticism on Irenaeus's development of the Spirit's role in revealing the divine economy yields a more complex understanding of the origins of early Christian pneumatology. In his presentation of the Valentinians' cosmogony, Irenaeus describes how these Gnostics believe that in the wake of the fall and restoration of Wisdom, Mind emitted the Holy Spirit and Christ, together;<sup>138</sup> this was done to stabilize the Pleroma, bring-

---

posiciones' del Padre y del Hijo en la historia del linaje humano, según el beneplácito de Dios."

135 See also *Haer.* 4.20.8 (SC 100:648–650), which speaks of the Spirit's role in preparing human beings to attain the vision and presence of God.

136 Irenaeus himself appears to link the Spirit's work of forming human beings into the likeness of God with the Spirit's work of testifying to the Son in *Epid.* 5–8 (SC 406:90–96).

137 The ancient notion of "presence" is broader than our modern sense of physical proximity; thus Paul can say that he is absent in body but present in spirit (1 Cor 5:3) and Jesus can speak of being present with his disciples even after his departure from this world (John 17:20–23). On this notion of the Paraclete disclosing its truth so that people may enter into and remain in God's presence, see further Cornelis Bennema, *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 2/148 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), esp. 213–248.

138 This is both similar to and slightly different from what Valentinus himself had taught; according to Irenaeus in *Haer.* 1.11.1 (SC 264:170), Valentinus suggested that the Spirit was emitted by the Aeon Truth in order to test the other Aeons and make them productive after the fall and restoration of Wisdom.

ing perfection to the other Aeons by instructing them that the First-Father is immeasurable and incomprehensible.<sup>139</sup> Thus, according to this cosmogony, the Spirit leads others into knowledge of the Father. The differences between this view of the Spirit and that of Irenaeus should not be downplayed, but the similarities are striking.<sup>140</sup> Nevertheless, here we see an interesting overlap with Irenaeus insofar as the Valentinians taught that the Spirit provided knowledge of the Father to other divine beings, even in the diminished sense of merely pointing out his incomprehensibility. In this context, Irenaeus's statements regarding the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit can be read as a clear counterpoint to this Gnostic claim. Whereas the Gnostics portrayed the Spirit as announcing the First-Father's incomprehensible nature to the divine Aeons, so Irenaeus presents the Spirit as testifying to the divinity and lordship of the Father and the Son. The specific differences reflect the vast gulf separating the Gnostic and Irenaeian views of God, but the underlying principle concerning this one important function of the Spirit appears surprisingly consistent.

Irenaeus then applies this principle to contest the Valentinians' account of the Holy Spirit's origin.<sup>141</sup> Again, Irenaeus does not take issue with the Spirit's role in testifying to the nature of the Father, instead merely suggesting that the Gnostics' view of God creates a logical problem for their belief in the Spirit's character, much less belief in the Son. We see this most clearly articulated when, at *Haer.* 4.35.2, he refutes the Valentinian claim that the Old Testament prophets were alternately inspired by one spirit from the Pleroma and another from the Demiurge. In context, this passage follows on the heels of Irenaeus's description of the Spirit as the means by which human beings are led into the knowledge of the truth concerning the divine economy,<sup>142</sup> at which point Irenaeus extends this principle to his polemic against the Marcionites

---

139 *Haer.* 1.2.5 (SC 264:44–46); cf. *Haer.* 1.12.4 (SC 264:186–188). As Lashier (*Irenaeus on the Trinity*, 35 n. 73) summarizes, Christ and the Holy Spirit “reveal to the Aeons the knowledge of First-Father so that none of them will repeat Sophia’s mistake”; specifically, “the Holy Spirit taught the Aeons to appreciate where they were in the creation and not to pursue more knowledge in the manner of Sophia.”

140 For instance, capturing some of this tension, Swete (*Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 56) observes that the Valentinians are in essence “attributing to the Holy Spirit functions such as the New Testament assigns to Him, but locating His activity in the pleroma and not in the world.” Likewise, more generally the Gnostics’ “view of the spiritual life led them to seek the sphere of [the Holy Spirit’s] operations in the intellect rather than in the moral nature of man” (*Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 66).

141 Cf. *Haer.* 2.12.7, 2.19.9 (SC 294:104–106, 198).

142 See again *Haer.* 4.33.7 (SC 100:818).



and the Valentinians.<sup>143</sup> Building his argument through a series of hypotheticals, Irenaeus arrives at a discussion of Christ's relationship to the teaching of the apostles and the prophets:

But if at his advent he sent forth his own apostles in a spirit of truth and not in a spirit of error, he did the very same thing also with respect to the prophets, for the Word of God is always the same. And if the spirit from the Pleroma was, according to their rule (*regula*), a spirit of light, a spirit of truth, a spirit of perfection, and a spirit of knowledge, while the one from the Demiurge was a spirit of ignorance and diminution and error and darkness, then how can there be in one and the same being perfection and diminution, knowledge and ignorance, error and truth, light and darkness?<sup>144</sup>

Thus, the notion of there being two distinct and opposing spirits in the Valentinian *regula* poses a problem for belief in the Word of God being "always the same"; in other words, the Valentinians cannot reject the authority of the Old Testament writings, which they attribute to the Demiurge, and at the same time accept the authority of Christ, given that Christ claimed to stand in continuity with and fulfill the Old Testament. Rather, Irenaeus insists, the Spirit who inspired the Hebrew prophets to proclaim the advent of Christ is the same Spirit who was at work in Christ and his apostles. In both cases, this one Spirit possesses full truth and perfect knowledge on account of the fact that this Spirit has always been present with God; as Irenaeus puts it earlier in this section, the true spiritual disciple receives the Spirit of God, who through all of the dispensations of God reveals and interprets the past, present, and future.<sup>145</sup> Accordingly, in the context of his wider argument against the Gnostic understanding of God, Irenaeus can appeal to the Spirit-inspired words of the Old Testament as evidence for true testimony to the deity and lordship of the Cre-

143 *Haer.* 4.34–35 (SC 100:846–876); cf. Donovan, *One Right Reading?*, 126.

144 *Haer.* 4.35.2 (SC 100:864–866): Si autem suos in suo adventu proprios Apostolos emisit in spiritu veritatis et non in spiritu erroris, hoc idem ipsum et in prophetis fecit: semper enim id ipsum Verbum Dei. Et si is quidem qui de Principalitate spiritus fuit, secundum regulam ipsorum, spiritus lucis et spiritus veritatis et spiritus perfectionis et spiritus agnitionis, is vero qui a Demiurgo fuit, spiritus ignorantiae et diminutionis et erroris et tenebrarum, quemadmodum in uno et eodem potuit esse perfectio et diminutio, agnitio et ignorantia, error et veritas, lux et tenebrae? Thanks to an anonymous reviewer who corrected some problems with my initial translation of this passage.

145 *Haer.* 4.33.1 (SC 100:802).

ator God, the same Father whom the Son, empowered by the Spirit, glorifies and reveals. In turn, by using this evidence from Scripture to support his claim of how the Spirit truly functions within the divine economy, Irenaeus can turn the tables on some of the Gnostics' own pneumatological ideas to refine his presentation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit.

Right belief concerning the Spirit's origin and nature, Irenaeus insists, is closely linked with possession of the Spirit in the present age. As *Haer.* 4.33.1 indicated, the spiritual disciple who receives the one true Spirit of God is the one who affirms the description of the divine economy as passed on through the *regula fidei* over and against the *regula* of the Gnostics. To put it another way, the sign that a person possesses the true Spirit of God is that he or she correctly understands the workings of the divine economy, which of course includes that same Spirit's testimony through the Old Testament prophets. Irenaeus's argument thus appears to be that possession of the Spirit is linked to acceptance of his *regula* and its concomitant understanding of the authority and inspiration of the Old Testament; that is, if one wants to discern and have the true Spirit of God, one must accept Irenaeus's understanding of the relationship between the two Testaments—and, therefore, explicitly reject that of the Gnostics.

Indeed, though we may be tempted to view this as a highly technical theological debate without much relevance for the affairs of this world, an ancient audience would have recognized that the issue of ordering the spiritual realm was in fact highly relevant to broader religious and political questions impacting their own lived experiences. Marx-Wolf has demonstrated that what she calls "taxonomic discourses" were constructed not as mere intellectual exercises but as efforts to "demote and discredit other ritual experts" while seeking to "carve out new areas of influence and authority for themselves."<sup>146</sup> In particular, the leaders of a religious group could strengthen the case for their authority by claiming that the deity that they worshipped was greater than the deities worshipped by adherents of rival religious groups.<sup>147</sup> In this context we can better appreciate that the Gnostics' dismissal of the Judeo-Christian God as a mere demiurge well down the food chain from the First-Father, as well as Irenaeus's counter-claim that the Gnostics' system of Aeons was an illogical myth, in fact represent competing claims to religious authority. Both the Gnostics and Irenaeus offered access to a Holy Spirit who would in turn offer some degree of access to the true fount of divinity, demonstrating the conceptual

---

<sup>146</sup> Marx-Wolf, *Spiritual Taxonomies*, 100–125 (here 101).

<sup>147</sup> Marx-Wolf, *Spiritual Taxonomies*, 122.

overlap that existed even amidst this competition. The winner of this competition for religious authority would, as expected in the ancient world, by extension also gain the social and political authority that came with such a role, as would more clearly become the case with the office of the Christian bishop in Late Antiquity.<sup>148</sup> The extent to which these “worldly” motives may have coexisted alongside more truly spiritual ones in the minds of people like Irenaeus is immaterial to the fact that the stakes in such taxonomic discourses had implications beyond the simply theological.

In sum, a broader consideration of Irenaeus’s more developed pneumatology yields a possible explanation for why Irenaeus adopted and expanded the link between the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony. It is the Spirit, Irenaeus insists, who reveals the divine economy to human beings on the basis of its unique qualifications; it is the Spirit, therefore, who likewise testifies within the Godhead concerning the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son, and records that testimony in the Scripture it inspires to edify the truly spiritual disciple in the pursuit of the knowledge of the truth. This view of the Spirit emerged in dialogue with Gnosticism, which presented itself to Irenaeus as a competing claimant for religious authority. Even as Irenaeus takes pains to differentiate his understanding of pneumatology and the divine economy from that of the Gnostics, the influence of Gnosticism on the nature of his particular formulation must not be discounted. As will also be seen in the following chapter of this book with respect to Tertullian, an “orthodox” understanding of the Spirit and its role in the divine economy was in fact inextricably shaped by and in constant dialogue with the pneumatological ideas of even “heretical” groups.

### Irenaeus: Summary and Implications

In this chapter, we have demonstrated that Irenaeus, like Justin before him, portrays the Spirit as the unique source of Trinitarian testimony. In light of the preceding analysis, we are now able to briefly answer the questions that we posed at the beginning of this chapter.

First, concerning how Irenaeus develops his understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit with respect to prosopological exegesis, we have con-

---

148 See especially Claudia Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005). Rapp’s central contention in this book is that a bishop possessed intersecting forms of authority, including spiritual, ascetic, and pragmatic.

cluded that Irenaeus, following Justin, portrays the Spirit as the unique source of Trinitarian testimony; in contrast to the other divine persons, the Spirit's testimony uniquely involves ascribing divinity and lordship to the Father and the Son. In particular, we have again found that when the Spirit speaks prosopologically, its Trinitarian testimony is exclusively directed within the Godhead, a phenomenon which we do not encounter with any other instances of prosopological exegesis in the writings of Irenaeus.

Second, regarding how Irenaeus links the Spirit with the notion of Trinitarian testimony in the context of his broader theological schema and in light of his engagement with Gnosticism, we concluded that Irenaeus identifies the Spirit as the source of revelation concerning the divine economy, a central element in Irenaeus's broader theology. In this way, Irenaeus goes beyond Justin by making more explicit the Spirit's role in directly teaching human beings its own testimony concerning the Father and the Son. This refinement of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit is further underscored by Irenaeus's depiction of the Spirit as tasked with preparing human beings to share in the Trinitarian life of the Godhead. His development of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit is most clearly marked by his engagement with Valentinian Gnosticism, which influenced the particular manner in which Irenaeus articulated the Spirit's testifying role. Specifically, Irenaeus uses the prosopological speech of the Spirit to challenge the Valentinians' beliefs concerning a multiplicity of divine Aeons and the moral character of the Creator God while maintaining the Gnostic emphasis on the Spirit revealing the divine economy. By engaging with the Gnostics on the topic of spiritual taxonomies, Irenaeus constructs a distinctive pneumatology that promotes his own religious authority over and against that of the Gnostics.

Third, concerning how Irenaeus's presentation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit compares with that of Justin, we have seen that Irenaeus follows Justin in several important respects: the use of prosopological exegesis to identify instances of the Spirit speaking theodramatically from its own person in certain Old Testament texts to testify to the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son, the exclusivity of the Spirit's testimony, and the use of the terms *θεολογέω* and *κυριολογέω* to describe this action of the Spirit. Still, we have also observed some significant differences in Irenaeus's approach: the new polemical context focused on limiting rather than expanding the potential referents for the terms "God" and "Lord," the clarification and expansion of his description of the nature of the Spirit's testimony, and the link between the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony and humankind's participation in the inner life of the Trinity. In sum, it appears that Irenaeus had a healthy respect for Justin, incorporating many of the former's central insights on this topic into his own work,

even as he felt the liberty to extend, clarify, and adapt the work of his predecessor to reflect new historical and theological contexts.

Having addressed these key questions, we finally turn to consider the significance of these findings for the future development of Christian views of the Spirit. Irenaeus's central legacy appears to be how he connected the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony with its broader function of revealing the divine economy. To give just one example of how later pro-Nicene writers further developed this aspect of Irenaeus's pneumatology, we may briefly consider the writings of Gregory of Nazianzus. Gregory, like Irenaeus, attributes the role of revealing the other persons of the Godhead to the Spirit, arguing that it is the Spirit's light by which the Son's light and therefore that of the Father can be seen.<sup>149</sup> More interestingly, however, Gregory extends the motif of the Spirit teaching about the other divine persons to portray the Spirit as teaching about itself; after citing the promise that the Holy Spirit will teach Jesus's disciples all things (John 14:26), Gregory includes the Spirit's own place in the Godhead to be one of those truths.<sup>150</sup> Just as the previous chapter of this book concluded that Basil of Caesarea expanded the idea of the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony such that Basil could "call Lord" the Spirit, so also Gregory extends it to identify the Spirit as God.

The conclusions we have reached in this chapter again have implications for how we understand the development of early Christian pneumatology. According to the Ayres-Barnes reconstruction of the development of early Christian pneumatology, Irenaeus represents the end of an initial period of Jewish-Christian "high" pneumatology. While this model is correct in grouping Justin and Irenaeus together as early Christian writers whose pneumatologies were heavily influenced by Judaism, one of its potential weaknesses is that other strands of pneumatological development that are not related to Christian adoption of Jewish ideas concerning the Spirit are largely ignored. Indeed, while many of Irenaeus's pneumatological developments must indeed be understood within the context of Jewish theology concerning the Spirit, as so persuasively argued first by Barnes and then especially by Briggman, this chapter has demonstrated that a more complete account of the development of early Christian pneumatology must *also* take into account other trajectories

149 *Orat.* 31.3 (SC 250:280).

150 *Orat.* 31.27 (SC 250:330). For an overview of Gregory of Nazianzus's pneumatology as presented in this oration, see further Christopher A. Beeley, "The Holy Spirit in Gregory Nazianzen: The Pneumatology of *Oration* 31," in *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Memory of Lloyd G. Patterson*, ed. Andrew B. McGowan, Brian E. Daley, and Timothy J. Gaden, VCSup 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 151–162, esp. 157–158 on *Orat.* 31.27.

of development, such as that involving prosopological exegesis and the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. In particular, Barnes seems to have overstated his case in outright “denying the thesis that ‘The [Christian] doctrine of the Spirit had to be constructed from the ground up using only the materials provided by the Scriptures.’”<sup>151</sup> Indeed, the Scriptures, when read prosopologically, contained precisely the raw materials for at least one trajectory of pneumatological innovation. Moreover, to the extent that alternative models of the development of early Christian pneumatology discount the role of Gnosticism in influencing Irenaeus’s particular formulation, this chapter has presented a more complex account of the theological exchanges that characterized this period.

This brings us to the conclusion of our study of Irenaeus and his development of the Spirit’s Trinitarian testimony. We now turn to the final key figure in this book, Tertullian, looking for continuities and discontinuities between his understanding of this topic and those of his predecessors, Justin and Irenaeus.

---

151 Barnes, “Beginning and End,” 170.

## Tertullian and the Decline of the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit

In this chapter, we extend our analysis of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit to a third and final key figure—Tertullian, “l’irascible ascète carthaginois,” who is generally regarded as one of the most important early Christian writers in the Latin tradition.<sup>1</sup> Continuing with the overall focus of this book, this chapter will examine how this fiery North African conceived of the relationship between the Spirit and testimony to other divine persons, with special attention to a key passage in chapter 11 of his *Against Praxeas* (ca. 210 C.E.). Having already examined how Justin Martyr and Irenaeus of Lyons understood the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, we will need to be particularly attentive to both continuities and discontinuities in Tertullian’s understanding of this subject.<sup>2</sup>

- 1 Philippe Henne, *Tertullien l’Africain* (Paris: Cerf, 2011), 53. For a biographical overview of Tertullian, see the revisionist work of Timothy David Barnes, *Tertullian: A Literary and Historical Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 1–29, which deconstructs the traditional portrait of Tertullian inherited from Jerome in *Vir. ill.* 53 (PL 23:698) and Eusebius at *Hist. eccl.* 2.2 (SC 31:53). See also Gerald Bray, *Holiness and the Will of God: Perspectives on the Theology of Tertullian* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), 8–31, 32–65; Heinrike Maria Zilling, *Tertullian: Untertan Gottes und der Kaisers* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004), 21–82; David E. Wilhite, *Tertullian the African: An Anthropological Reading of Tertullian’s Context and Identities*, Millennium-Studien 14 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), 17–27. For overviews of scholarly inquiry into the origins and spread of Christianity in North Africa, see David Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 10–16; Geoffrey D. Dunn, *Tertullian*, ECF (London: Routledge, 2004), 13–15; Wilhite, *Tertullian*, 31–35; François Decret, *Early Christianity in North Africa*, trans. Edward L. Smither (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2009), 10–16; J. Patout Burns Jr. and Robin M. Jensen, *Christianity in Roman Africa: The Development of Its Practices and Beliefs* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 1–6.
- 2 This chapter assumes Tertullian had access to the writings of both Justin and Irenaeus. With respect to the former, Ernest Evans, ed. and trans., *Tertullian’s Treatise against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (London: SPCK, 1948; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 31, claims that Tertullian “reproduces [Justin’s expositions] without the tentativeness and reserve which were natural to that gentler mind.” Tertullian’s debt to Justin is perhaps best evidenced in his *Adv. Jud.* and *Apol.* Tertullian explicitly references Justin and Irenaeus as sources for his anti-Gnostic polemic in *Val.* 5.1 (CCSL 2:756). See further J.H. Waszink, “Tertullian’s Principles and Methods of Exegesis,” in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant*, ed. William

In the following pages, we will consider the specific manner in which Tertullian begins to dissolve the link between prosopological exegesis and Trinitarian testimony, preserving the role of the Spirit's testimony within the divine economy while adapting it to his unique historical context and theological concerns. Specifically, Tertullian employs the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit to combat modalistic monarchianism, a theological movement characterized by the belief that Father, Son, and Spirit are simply different modes or aspects of the one divine person as required for the progression of the divine economy,<sup>3</sup> as well as to buttress his support of the New Prophecy, the charismatic and rigorous religious movement later known as Montanism.<sup>4</sup> We will also analyze the extent to which Tertullian's influence in this regard was felt on the next genera-

---

R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken, *ThH* 53 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1979), 21. *Val.* and *Praescr.* are generally cited as the two works of Tertullian which draw most extensively on Irenaeus. The extent to which either may have influenced Tertullian's notions of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit will be explored and validated in more detail later in this chapter.

- 3 The literature on this theological movement, both ancient and modern, has given it many names. I refer to it as "modalistic monarchianism" to distinguish it from "monarchianism" as a term often used to describe Tertullian's own theology in light of his emphasis on belief in one God; cf. Tertullian's own usage at *Prax.* 3.2 (FC 34:110). The literature also refers to this movement as "Sabellianism" after one of its greatest proponents or as "patripassianism" on account of its implication that the Father truly suffered and died in the form of the Son. It is also to be distinguished from the related movement, often termed "dynamic monarchianism," which is often associated with Theodotus the Cobbler and Paul of Samosata. While these terms are widely used in the literature, note the dissenting opinion of John Behr, *The Way to Nicaea*, vol. 1 of *Formation of Christian Theology* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 138 n. 1. For introductions to the monarchian controversy, see Behr, *The Way to Nicaea*, 137–235; Evans, *Praxeas*, 6–18; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 3rd ed. (London: Black, 1965), 115–126. Kelly (*Early Christian Doctrines*, 119) posits that modalistic monarchianism was a reaction to the Logos doctrine articulated by figures such as Justin and Irenaeus. The most comprehensive ancient account is found in Hippolytus at *Haer.* 9.7–10 (PTS 25:342–349), which claims that modalistic monarchianism made its way to Rome via Epigonus, a disciple of Noetus, during the pontificate of Zephyrinus. According to Hippolytus, then, Noetus of Smyrna was the first figure to articulate modalistic monarchianism towards the end of the second century.
- 4 For an overview of Montanism, which emerged from Phrygia ca. 165 C.E. under the leadership of Montanus, see Christine Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), emphasizing how the condemnation of Montanism likely stemmed from controversy over the nature of authority, with Montanism's promotion of direct revelation threatening established church leadership. On Montanus and the emergence of the New Prophecy in Phrygia, see further *ibid.*, 26–45, 77–86. Alistair Stewart-Sykes, "The Original Condemnation of Asian Montanism," *JEH* 50 (1999): 1–22, is a further helpful introduction, instead tracing the eventual condemnation of Montanism to its rural roots. Other essential works include Ronald E. Heine, *The Montanist Oracles and Testimo-*



tion of Latin writers, focusing especially on Cyprian of Carthage and Novatian of Rome. By the end of this chapter, we will have identified and analyzed a third and final early Christian writer who played an instrumental role in the development of this particular trajectory of pre-Nicene pneumatology.

First, however, we will briefly consider how scholarship has understood Tertullian's pneumatology and its significance. Given Tertullian's rather unique status as a prodigious early Christian writer who was greatly influenced by the New Prophecy, much of the focus on Tertullian's pneumatology has been placed upon elucidating his "Montanist" views of the Spirit.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Tertullian represents this particular theological movement insofar as he came to see the Holy Spirit as the promised Paraclete of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>6</sup> For Tertullian, the Paraclete is the source of continuing, ecstatic revelation,<sup>7</sup> though he insists that this revelation does not contradict the teachings of Christ and the apostles but rather brings clarity and illumination to them.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, though Tertullian claims that the Paraclete has authority over the discipline and restitution of Christians as a result of its function of leading Christians into all truth, he likewise insists that this will be in line with catholic tradition.<sup>9</sup> As for the Ayres-Barnes account of the development of early Christian pneumatology,

---

nia, NAPSPMS 14 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989); William Tabbernee, *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*, NAPSPMS 16 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997); idem, *Prophets and Gravestones: An Imaginative History of Montanists and Other Early Christians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009). Though "Montanism" is an anachronistic term for the religious movement that described itself as the "New Prophecy," I will follow the literature in using the terms largely interchangeably.

- 5 See, e.g., Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Holy Spirit—In Biblical Teaching, through the Centuries, and Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 178–183.
- 6 That Tertullian believes the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete to be one and the same, see further Douglas Powell, "Tertullianists and Cataphrygians," *VC* 29 (1975): 40. On the Paraclete in Montanism, see further Trevett, *Montanism*, 62–66.
- 7 *Mon.* 2–3 (CCSL 2:1229–1233); *An.* 9.4, 58.8 (CCSL 2:792, 869); *Res.* 11.2 (CCSL 2:933); *Prax.* 1.5 (FC 34:100).
- 8 *Mon.* 2–3 (CCSL 2:1229–1233); *Res.* 63.9 (CCSL 2:1012). T.P. O'Malley, *Tertullian and the Bible: Language—Imagery—Exegesis* (Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1967), 133–134, suggests that Tertullian turned to Montanism precisely because in the revelation of the Paraclete he found a definitive solution to the problem of the ambiguities of Scripture.
- 9 *Virg.* 1.4–7 (CCSL 2:1209–1210); *Mon.* 2 (CCSL 2:1229–1230); *Pud.* 21 (SC 394:268–274); *Jejun.* 1.3 (CCSL 2:1257); *Marc.* 1.29.4 (SC 365:242); *Prax.* 2.1 (FC 34:102); cf. John 16:13. Conversely, Tertullian argues for the cessation of the Spirit from Judaism following the coming of Christ; cf. *Adv. Jud.* 13.15 (FC 75:286); *Marc.* 5.8 (PL 2:521B); cp. *Dial.* 87.5 (PTS 47:222).

Tertullian is significant insofar as he was a pivotal figure in the abandonment of the Jewish-Christian views of the Spirit held by his predecessors, instead developing a distinctively Christian pneumatology that related the Spirit to the Father and the Son on the basis of “order” (*taxis* or *gradus*).<sup>10</sup>

Beyond this basic overview, however, two scholarly debates concerning Tertullian’s view of the Spirit are of particular concern for this book. Both of these debates revolve around the interpretation of *Prax.*, in which Tertullian presents his most sustained argument against modalistic monarchianism as well as his own constructive presentation of what will set the foundation for later catholic thought on the Trinity, redefining the concepts of the monarchy and the economy to allow for both unity and diversity within the Godhead, thereby paving the way for later Christian writers in the Nicene tradition.<sup>11</sup>

One debate has centered upon the extent to which Tertullian’s Montanist leanings shaped his broader articulation of a Trinitarian doctrine of God, a topic which of course includes the Spirit insofar as it is viewed as the third person of this Trinity. On the one hand, some scholars have argued that the New Prophecy was in fact to a large degree responsible for the Trinitarian position formulated by Tertullian in this treatise.<sup>12</sup> For instance, according to Barnes, this text “exemplifies a paradox: Tertullian helped to rescue the Catholic Church from theological heresy precisely because he was a Montanist.”<sup>13</sup> On the

10 See again the introduction of this book; cf. Lewis Ayres and Michel René Barnes, “Pneumatology: Historical and Methodological Considerations,” *AugStud* 39 (2008): 163–236, and especially Michel René Barnes, “The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology,” *AugStud* 39 (2008): 170, 184–186.

11 See especially Kevin B. McCrudden, “Monarchy and Economy in Tertullian’s *Adversus Praxeum*,” *SJT* 55 (2002): 325–337. As Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, 3 vols. (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1950–1960), 2:285, puts it, this treatise “represents the most important contribution to the doctrine of the Trinity in the Ante-Nicene period.” Tertullian appears to have been the first Latin writer to use the word *trinitas* to describe the unity and diversity of the Godhead. On the context and significance of *Prax.* for the development of Trinitarian theology, see Eric Osborn, *Tertullian: First Theologian of the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 133–136; Andrew B. McGowan, “God in Early Latin Theology: Tertullian and the Trinity,” in *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Memory of Lloyd G. Patterson*, ed. Andrew B. McGowan, Brian E. Daley, and Timothy J. Gaden, *VCSup* 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 61–81; Sergio Zañartu, “Notas sobre el pensamiento trinitario de Tertuliano en *Adversus Praxeum*,” *TV* 55 (2014): 405–434.

12 See, e.g., Claire Ann Bradley Stegman, “The Development of Tertullian’s Doctrine of *Spiritus Sanctus*” (PhD diss., Southern Methodist University, 1978); Andrew McGowan, “Tertullian and the ‘Heretical’ Origins of the ‘Orthodox’ Trinity,” *J ECS* 14 (2006): 440–457.

13 Barnes, *Tertullian*, 142.

other hand, some scholars have downplayed the significance of Montanism in the development of Tertullian's view of the Spirit over the course of his life. With respect to the Spirit's position within the Trinity, David Wilhite has argued that there is a basic continuity in Tertullian's view of the Spirit over the course of his life. In particular, Wilhite argues that despite a change in Tertullian's pneumatological vocabulary, his basic understanding of the Spirit remains the same even after his "conversion" to the New Prophecy, particularly insofar as he was indebted to New Testament ideas.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, many of Tertullian's statements about prophecy and the dichotomy between "flesh" and "spirit" have much in common with Paul's Corinthian correspondence,<sup>15</sup> and his use of Paraclete language may have more to do with Johannine pneumatology than with Montanism.<sup>16</sup> Still, it should be noted that the "Montanist" Tertullian argued that the Paraclete's authority extends beyond mere discipline into the realm of doctrine as well, as it is the Spirit who leads people into a correct understanding of the Trinity.<sup>17</sup> This represents a potential discontinuity that will be discussed in more detail below when we consider the extent to which Tertullian's embrace of the New Prophecy may have impacted his view of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit.

A second key debate concerns the extent to which Tertullian's pneumatology endows the Spirit with a unique personhood, with *Prax.* again serving as the pivotal text. On the one hand, many scholars have demonstrated that Tertullian elevates the deity and personhood of the Spirit. Adolf Harnack suggests that Tertullian was in fact the first to call the Spirit "God,"<sup>18</sup> and Henry Swete commends Tertullian as a writer who "sees clearly in what respects the persons of the Son and the Spirit are distinct from the person of the Father, and wherein

14 See, e.g., David E. Wilhite, "The Spirit of Prophecy: Tertullian's Pauline Pneumatology," in Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite, *Tertullian and Paul*, vol. 1 of *Pauline and Patristic Scholars in Debate* (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 45–71.

15 Wilhite, "Spirit of Prophecy," 53–56.

16 Wilhite, "Spirit of Prophecy," 59.

17 *Prax.* 2.1, 8.5, 30.5 (FC 34:102, 132, 252); cf. Robert F. Evans, *One and Holy: The Church in Latin Patristic Thought* (London: SPCK, 1972), 30. Rankin (*Tertullian and the Church*, 48) argues that the Spirit's relationship with doctrine was such that "the New Prophecy for Tertullian did not seek to replace the Scriptures; it sought rather only to illuminate and support them by removing the dangers presented by those ambiguities which are regularly and wilfully seized upon by the heretics." As such, O'Malley (*Tertullian and the Bible*, 132) is wrong to suggest that Tertullian has made Scripture increasingly irrelevant.

18 Adolf Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. Neil Buchanan, 7 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1896–1905), 4:110.

the three persons must be one; and he indicates the way in which, distinctions notwithstanding, unity may remain unbroken.”<sup>19</sup> As a result, Stanley Burgess can speak of Tertullian as “the Church’s first important pentecostal theologian,” as Tertullian, “more than any theologian before him, is able to distinguish the personhood and work of the Spirit from that of the Father and the Son.”<sup>20</sup> Still, other scholars have found Tertullian to be largely uninterested in pursuing the Spirit’s relation to the Godhead more deeply. Thus, Harnack can also write that Tertullian had “no specific theological interest” in this doctrine,<sup>21</sup> and David Wilhite argues concerning *Prax.* that “the work most renowned for Trinitarian thinking has surprisingly little to say about the unique personhood of the Spirit, who seems to be more an afterthought, a third who necessarily follows the discussion of the second.”<sup>22</sup> Perhaps the most balanced statement on this issue is that of Andrew McGowan, who notes Tertullian’s “lack of emphasis on the third person of the Trinity” (which he attributes to the nature of the monarchical controversy) and yet indicates that *Prax.* “presents the real existence and personality of the Holy Spirit at least more distinctly than many other writings of the first two or three centuries of Christian thought, including Tertullian’s own earlier works.”<sup>23</sup>

Entering into the scholarly conversation regarding this second debate, and per the purposes of this study, this chapter will focus on the extent to which Tertullian utilizes prosopological exegesis to endow the Holy Spirit with a dis-

- 
- 19 Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1912), 105. Likewise, Quasten (*Patrology*, 2:325) finds it significant that Tertullian identifies the Holy Spirit as “the third person” of the Godhead; Kelly (*Early Christian Doctrines*, 114) finds the explicit identification of the Spirit as a divine person to be an advance from the views of Irenaeus.
  - 20 Stanley M. Burgess, *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984), 63.
  - 21 Harnack, *History of Dogma*, 4:110.
  - 22 Wilhite, “Spirit of Prophecy,” 59. Wilhite earlier comments that while “it would be tempting to assume that Tertullian’s definition of *spiritus* shifted in his ‘Montanist’ period from an impersonal force to a personal agent, since the New Prophecy would devote more attention to the distinct personhood of the Holy Spirit,” Tertullian nevertheless even in his “Montanist” writings “continues to discuss the s/Spirit of God as an impersonal substance” and even in his “pre-Montanist” writings describes the Spirit in more personal terms (“Spirit of Prophecy,” 52). Wilhite’s thesis is that the personhood of the Spirit is most clear in Tertullian’s writings when Tertullian is drawing on Pauline texts (“Spirit of Prophecy,” 61). We will return to this claim below in our consideration of Tertullian’s use of prosopological exegesis.
  - 23 McGowan, “Tertullian and the Trinity,” 62.

tinct personhood, particularly insofar as it relates to its testimony to other divine beings. Indeed, in his commentary on *Prax.* 11.7–8 that “there appears to be no parallel to Tertullian’s suggestion that the Holy Spirit refers here to the Son as ‘my lord.’”<sup>24</sup> Agreeing with this, in his groundbreaking article on prosopological exegesis, Carl Andresen goes on to assert that Tertullian, by including the Spirit in intra-divine conversation in *Prax.* 11, thus extends to the Spirit the identity of a third divine person in what is now understood to be a Triune God.<sup>25</sup> As the previous two chapters of this book have endeavored to demonstrate, Evans and Andresen were wrong to dismiss the extent to which the Spirit was portrayed as a primary speaking agent in the writings of Tertullian’s predecessors, namely Justin and Irenaeus. That being said, we need to devote more attention to Andresen’s claim that Tertullian is linking prosopological exegesis with a more highly elevated view of the Spirit’s personhood; indeed, in light of other scholars’ disagreement with Andresen on precisely this point,<sup>26</sup> a more careful and thorough analysis of this subject is needed, to which we now turn.

### Tertullian and the Trinitarian Testimony of the Spirit

As noted above, scholars have identified *Prax.* 11.7–8 as the *crux interpretum* for Tertullian’s use of prosopological exegesis from the Spirit and its potential associations with personhood and divine testimony. In context, this passage is part of a broader attempt to demonstrate, against the modalistic monarchians, that the Old Testament identifies multiple divine persons. Having just provided examples of prosopological speech from the Father and the Son, Tertullian makes the following argument:

Consider also the Spirit speaking from a third person (*ex tertia persona*) concerning the Father and the Son: *The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet* [Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1)]. Again through Isaiah: *Thus says the Lord to my Lord Christ* [Isa 45:1]. Likewise through the same [prophet], to the Father concerning the Son: *Lord, who has believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord*

24 Evans, *Praxeas*, 256.

25 Carl Andresen, “Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffes,” *ZNW* 52 (1961): 22–23.

26 Michael Slusser, “The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology,” *TS* 49 (1988): 476.

*revealed? We have announced concerning him: like a young boy, like a root in a thirsty land, also there was no beauty or glory of his [Isa 53:1–2].*<sup>27</sup>

Passing over the nuances of Tertullian's argument for the moment, it is clear that Tertullian is at least to some extent following in the footsteps of his predecessors Justin and Irenaeus on this subject: Tertullian, like Justin and Irenaeus, presents the Spirit as a speaking character in line with the ancient reading strategy of prosopological exegesis and, more specifically, as the speaker of the words of Ps 110:1 among other Old Testament texts that could be construed as involving two other divine persons. Our initial impression, therefore, may be that Tertullian is simply "copy-and-pasting" the views of Justin and Irenaeus regarding the Spirit's unique function in providing divine testimony to the Father and the Son.

That being said, a second glance at this passage also yields some interesting discontinuities. For one thing, the language of the Spirit calling the Father and the Son "Lord" and "God," so central to his predecessors' understanding of the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony, is conspicuously absent. It is also striking that the Spirit is explicitly identified as speaking from its own person (*ex persona*), whereas Justin and Irenaeus in their introductions to prosopological exegesis never so declared the Spirit to be a speaking person (*πρόσωπον*) in its own right but rather portrayed the Spirit as the being who conforms itself to speak in the persons of the Father and the Son.<sup>28</sup> Finally, the context of this passage, an assault on the claims of modalistic monarchianism, is different from the polemical contexts of the passages we have studied in the previous chapters of this book.

These similarities and differences between Tertullian and his predecessors on this subject generate several questions that we will consider over the course of this chapter: How does Tertullian develop his understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, particularly with respect to prosopological exegesis? How does Tertullian link the Spirit with the notion of Trinitarian testimony in

27 *Prax.* 11.7–8 (FC 34:146–148): *Animadvertē etiam Spiritum loquentem ex tertia persona de Patre et Filio: Dixit dominus Domino meo: sede ad dexteram meam, donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum. Item per Esaiam: Haec dicit Dominus Domino meo Christo; item per eundem ad Patrem de Filio: Domine, quis credidit auditui nostro et brachium Domini cui revelatum est? Annuntiavimus de illo: sicut puerulus, sicut radix in terra sitiēti et non erat forma eius nec gloria.*

28 Of course, the previous two chapters of this book have sought to demonstrate that there are places in which these writers seem to implicitly give the Spirit this function and thus some measure of distinctive personhood.

the context of his broader theological constructs, and what influence did the New Prophecy have on this formulation? How did Tertullian's immediate successors in the Latin tradition, namely Cyprian and Novatian, appropriate his approach to the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony? As we search for answers to each of these questions, we will be increasingly able to distinguish Tertullian's understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit from how it was conceived and developed by his predecessors Justin and Irenaeus.

As has been our procedure in the previous chapters of this book, we will begin by considering Tertullian's broader understanding of prosopological exegesis before returning to a more careful examination of his argument concerning the Spirit in *Prax.* 11.7–8. Unlike either Justin or Irenaeus, Tertullian's most vivid presentation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit is a part of his larger overview of his use of prosopological exegesis, and as such our primary analysis can be confined to just this one text, *Prax.* 11.

### *Tertullian's Use of Prosopological Exegesis*

Given the relative brevity and clarity of Tertullian's description of prosopological exegesis, it is not surprising that modern scholars writing on the subject place it front and center in their own presentations.<sup>29</sup> As it is generally accepted that Tertullian's argument in *Prax.* 11 drew on an earlier exegetical tradition reflected in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus,<sup>30</sup> we will want to be partic-

29 Andresen, "Zur Entstehung," 18–25; Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier Recherches et bilan, 2: Exégèse prosopologique et théologie* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1985), 30–34; Slusser, "Exegetical Roots," 464–466; Matthew W. Bates, *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Interpretation* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012), 185–186; idem, *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 27–28.

30 Bates, *Birth*, 27. Andresen ("Zur Entstehung," 19) identifies Irenaeus as a particularly significant source for Tertullian in this passage. Indeed, there is little doubt that Tertullian had access to the work of Justin and Irenaeus, and his use of these writers elsewhere makes the case for recurrence. Likewise, with respect to the criterion of volume, the "person" language and the citation of Ps 110:1 as the words of the Spirit make the case for Tertullian's direct use of at least one of these writers quite high. See further Andresen, "Zur Entstehung," 11–12. Martin C. Albl, *"And Scripture Cannot Be Broken": The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 46 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 127, suggests that this passage instead derived from an independent *testimonia* source, but does not consider the similarities to related passages in Justin and Irenaeus. Again, differences in the wording of the biblical quotations should not count as evidence for the use of a *testimonia* source because Tertullian, unlike Justin and Irenaeus, wrote in Latin and not Greek.

ularly attentive to how Tertullian's presentation of prosopological exegesis is both similar to and different from those found in the works of his predecessors.

In *Prax.* 11, Tertullian is concerned to show from Scripture, against the modalistic monarchians, the distinction between the Father and the Son. Thus, Tertullian cites Ps 45:1 as evidence of God speaking about a Word that is not identical with himself and then Ps 2:7 as evidence of the Father speaking to the Son. In both cases, Tertullian insists, it would be a violation of the plain sense of the text to equate the Father with the Son. In contrast to such an illogical reading of the Old Testament, Tertullian makes the following claim:

All the Scriptures disclose both the demonstration and the distinction of the Trinity (*trinitatis*); from them also is deduced our rule: the person speaking and the person spoken of and the person spoken to cannot be considered one and the same, because neither perversity nor deceit are consistent with God, so that, although it was himself to whom he was speaking, nevertheless he speaks to another and not to his own self.<sup>31</sup>

As Carl Andresen initially pointed out, this “heuristisches Prinzip” of Tertullian is intricately linked to his doctrine of the Trinity.<sup>32</sup> As this passage demonstrates, Tertullian justifies his prosopological reading of the Old Testament on the basis of his belief in the Triune God, though, as we will see, he inverts this logic at the end of this passage.

At this point, Tertullian turns to his proof-texts of speech he identifies as involving multiple persons of the Trinity:

Observe therefore also other words of the Father concerning the Son through Isaiah: *Behold my son, whom I have chosen, my beloved, in whom I am well-pleased; I will place my spirit upon him and he will announce judgment to the nations* [Isa 42:1]. Observe also what [he says] to him: *It is a great thing for you to be called my son, to establish the tribes of Jacob and to turn back the dispersion of Israel; I have placed you for a light to the nations, that you may be salvation unto the end of the earth* [Isa 49:6]. Observe now

31 *Prax.* 11.4 (FC 34:146): scripturae omnes et demonstrationem et distinctionem trinitatis ostendant a quibus et praescriptio nostra deducitur non posse unum atque eundem videri qui loquitur et de quo loquitur et ad quem loquitur, quia neque perversitas neque fallacia Deo congruat ut, cum ipse esset ad quem loquebatur, ad alium potius et non ad semetipsum loquatur.

32 Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 18.



also the words of the Son concerning the Father: *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for he has anointed me to preach good news to humanity* [Isa 61:1]. Likewise in a psalm [the Son speaks] to the Father about the same: *Do not forsake me, until I announce your arm to the whole generation to come* [Ps 71:18 (LXX 70:18)]. Likewise in another [psalm]: *Lord, why have the ones who oppress me increased?* [Ps 3:1 (LXX 3:2)]. But indeed nearly all the psalms sustain the person (*personam*) of Christ and represent the Son speaking to the Father—that is, Christ to God.<sup>33</sup>

Tertullian next goes on to give examples of speech from the Spirit, but given their importance for this study, our analysis of those quotations will be saved for the following section. With respect to this present passage, we immediately note that Tertullian's understanding of prosopological exegesis includes both statements concerning other divine persons (Isa 42:1, 61:1) as well as statements made to other divine persons (Isa 49:6; Ps 71:18, 3:1), reinforcing his above reference to passages in which a person is "spoken of" and passages in which a person is "spoken to." This places the scope of Tertullian's prosopological exegesis more on par with that of Justin rather than that of Irenaeus, which as we saw in the previous chapter of this study appears to have had a more limited scope.

As for the quotations themselves, however, Tertullian seems to follow Irenaeus more than Justin in selecting examples of prosopological exegesis from the Father and the Son. Tertullian provides Isa 42:1 and 49:6 as illustrations of the Father's prosopological speech, but Justin's introduction includes none of these, while Irenaeus's at least cites Isa 49:5–6.<sup>34</sup> As for examples of the

33 Prax. 11.5–7 (FC 34:146): *Accipe igitur et alias voces Patris de Filio per Esaiam: Ecce filius meus, quem elegi, dilectus meus, in quem bene sensi; ponam spiritum meum super ipsum et iudicium nationibus annuntiabit. Accipe et ad ipsum: Magnum tibi est, ut voceris filius meus ad statuendas tribus Iacob et ad convertendam dispersionem Israelis; posui te in lucem nationum, ut sis salus in extremum terrae. Accipe nunc et Filii voces de Patre: Spiritus Domini super me, quapropter unxit me ad evangelizandum hominibus. Item ad Patrem in psalmo de eodem: Ne derelinqueris me, donec annuntiem brachium tuum natiuitati universae venturae; item in alio: Domine, quid multiplicati sunt qui comprimunt me?* Sed et omnes paene psalmi Christi personam sustinent, Filium ad Patrem id est Christum ad Deum verba facientem repraesentant.

34 See 1 *Apol.* 37 (SC 507:226) and *Epid.* 49–50 (SC 406:154–156). Justin does, however, at *Dial.* 123.8 (PTS 47:283) cite Isa 42:1–4 and interpret it as the Father speaking concerning the Son, and at *Dial.* 121.4 (PTS 47:280) cite Isa 49:6 and interpret it as the Father speaking to the Son. According to Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition—Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*, NovTSup56 (Leiden: Brill,

Son's prosopological speech, Tertullian points to Isa 61:1, Ps 71:18, and Ps 3:1; while the introductions of neither Justin nor Irenaeus cite any of these texts, Irenaeus does elsewhere give Isa 61:1 as an example of the Son's prosopological speech, and Justin does not ever utilize any of these passages.<sup>35</sup> This brings us to an interesting conclusion: while Tertullian's understanding of the scope of prosopological exegesis is more akin to that of Justin, his selection of Old Testament passages more closely resembles that of Irenaeus. As such, in the absence of further evidence, it is unclear whether Tertullian is drawing on Justin or Irenaeus (or, perhaps, both) in *Prax.* 11.

Following his examples of prosopological speech from Father, Son, and Spirit, Tertullian at the conclusion of *Prax.* 11 reverses what he posited earlier in the chapter by seeming to suggest that the doctrine of the Trinity is to some extent derived from his prosopological reading of the Old Testament, and not the other way around:

Thus in these passages, however few, the distinction of the Trinity is clearly set forth. For there is the Spirit himself who speaks, the Father to whom he speaks, and the Son of whom he speaks. Likewise the rest, which are spoken sometimes by the Father concerning the Son or to the Son, sometimes by the Son concerning the Father or to the Father, sometimes by the Spirit, establish each person (*personam*) as distinct.<sup>36</sup>

In this passage, Tertullian argues that his prosopological reading of the Old Testament gave rise to his identification of the three persons (*personae*) of the Trinity, a point first noted by Andresen, who gave particular attention to how Tertullian developed his understanding of "person" out of Old Testament passages where persons were only implicitly in view insofar as these quotations were to some degree dialogical in nature or directed to a particular individual.<sup>37</sup>

---

1987), 349–350, Isa 42:1–4 and 49:6 were likely passed down as part of a larger "Christianized version of a Jewish proselyte tradition." Irenaeus's extant writings do not ever quote Isa 42:1.

35 See *Haer.* 3.18.3 (SC 211:352) and *Epid.* 53 (SC 406:160). Irenaeus's extant writings do not quote Ps 3:1 or Ps 71:18.

36 *Prax.* 11.9–10 (FC 34:148): His itaque paucis tamen manifeste distinctio trinitatis exponitur. Est enim ipse qui pronuntiat Spiritus et Pater ad quem pronuntiat et Filius de quo pronuntiat. Sic et cetera, quae nunc a Patre de Filio vel ad Filium, nunc a Filio de Patre vel ad Patrem, nunc a Spiritu pronuntiantur, unamquamque personam in sua proprietate constituunt.

37 Andresen, "Zur Entstehung," 11: "In [the examples of *Prax.* 11–13] ist der Personbegriff selbst

As Michael Slusser aptly concludes with respect to the relationship between prosopological exegesis and the development of Trinitarian theology, "It is difficult to say which came first, the exegesis of experience or the exegesis of Scripture."<sup>38</sup>

The novel components of Tertullian's approach are striking. The first unique element of Tertullian's prosopological method is the link between his scriptural exegesis and the notion of "person" as used in constructing his doctrine of the Trinity. This is most clearly seen in the shift from the language of Justin and Irenaeus, who spoke of the Logos or the Spirit speaking "in the character" or "from the person" (ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου) of the Father or the Son (or, as we have seen, on occasion from the Holy Spirit, at least implicitly), and that of Tertullian, who here presents Father, Son, and Spirit as speaking, without intermediary, as fully distinct persons (*ex persona*).<sup>39</sup> In his discussion of Tertullian's use of the term *persona*, Eric Osborn argues that Tertullian uses the term to refer to "the effective manifestation of a distinct being," that, while not a metaphysical statement, nevertheless communicates something true about the inner life of God.<sup>40</sup> Though the term would fall out of favor in later centuries, particularly in the Greek-speaking world where *hypostasis* (ὑπόστασις) would come to replace *persona*,<sup>41</sup> Tertullian's starting point of "one substance in three persons" paved the way for the Christian understanding of God to include both unity

---

nicht im Text enthalten, sondern wird aus dem Dialogcharakter bzw. den Anredeformeln im Text des Schriftwortes erschlossen." See further Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques*, 30; Slusser, "Exegetical Roots," 465.

38 Slusser, "Exegetical Roots," 476.

39 Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques*, 33: "[Prax. 11] mérite de figurer aussi dans les dossiers de l'histoire de l'exégèse, car il offre l'exemple le plus parfait qu'on puisse trouver d'une exégèse prosopologique pure, sans aucun mélange d'exégèse prophétique." Tertullian does, on rare occasion, also present the Spirit as speaking in the *persona* of others, such as the apostles in *Marc.* 4.22.12 (SC 456:286).

40 Osborn, *Tertullian*, 137. Evans (*Praxeas*, 14) notes that *persona* has a legal usage that can mean "one who has an existence and a status and rights of his own as well as relations and obligations in respect of others."

41 Osborn, *Tertullian*, 138. J.F. Bethune-Baker, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon* (London: Methuen, 1903), 234, blames Sabellius and his followers for spoiling the term for future centuries of doctrinal refinement. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory*, trans. Graham Harrison, 5 vols. (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1992), 3:211, likewise notes that "whereas in the West (in Tertullian), the literary metaphor occasionally rises to the level of theological significance, it is rejected in the East because of the danger of its being misunderstood in a Sabellian sense (one God who converses with himself in three 'roles' or 'masks').".

(in terms of *substantia*, *status*, and *potestas*) and distinction (with respect to *gradus*, *forma*, and *species*).<sup>42</sup> Given that the modalistic monarchians could have plausibly interpreted theatrical language of masks and characters in a way that served their theological agenda, Tertullian thus attempted to bring the notion of divine personhood out of the literary sphere and into a discussion of the internal dynamics of the Godhead.<sup>43</sup> It is, therefore, with good reason that Matthew Bates can argue that prosopological exegesis was “irreducibly essential to the birth of the Trinity.”<sup>44</sup>

A second proposed unique element of Tertullian’s presentation of prosopological exegesis, as noted above and as will be considered in more detail below, is that it explicitly includes the Spirit, alongside the Father and Son, as a distinct divine person. Indeed, many scholars have noted that *Prax.* 11.7–8 contains the clearest examples of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Spirit.<sup>45</sup>

42 Osborn, *Tertullian*, 121–139; cf. *Prax.* 2.4 (FC 34:106). On these various terms, see further David Rankin, “Tertullian’s Vocabulary of the Divine ‘Individuals’ in *adversus Praxeas*,” *SacEr* 40 (2001): 5–46; Joseph Moingt, *Théologie trinitaire de Tertullien*, 4 vols. (Paris: Aubier, 1966–1969), 2:299–674.

43 Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques*, 33–34. Evans (*Praxeas*, 46) writes that when Tertullian uses *persona* in *Prax.* 11, “possibly the dramatic sense is in mind, but it is no longer prominent, and we have reached the point where we are almost ready to speak of three Persons.” A similar view is articulated by von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama*, 3:210. See further Osborn, *Tertullian*, 142–143, on Tertullian’s legacy with respect to his Trinitarian vocabulary.

44 Bates, *Birth*, 28. We should, however, be careful to recognize that Tertullian even into his “Montanist” period also continues to portray the Spirit as an impersonal force; as Wilhite adeptly observes, “one finds the key variable for determining which usage Tertullian will employ to be Tertullian’s dialogical interlocutor and his rhetorical aim” (“Spirit of Prophecy,” 52). Likewise, James D.G. Dunn, “Tertullian and Paul on the Spirit of Prophecy,” in *Tertullian and Paul*, ed. Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite, vol. 1 of *Pauline and Patristic Scholars in Debate* (New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 74, points out that material views of the Spirit do not “impl[y] the absence of personality.” Further complicating matters, Tertullian on occasion refers to Christ as the “Spirit of God,” as at *Apol.* 23.12 (CCSL 1:132); *Marc.* 3.16.5, 4.28.10, 4.33.9, 5.8 (SC 399:146; SC 456:364, 410; PL 2:521B); *Res.* 37.7 (CCSL 2:970); *Prax.* 14.6 (FC 34:166). This binitarian language perhaps reflects Tertullian’s continued use of impersonal understandings of the Spirit and has roots in Paul’s own occasional conflation of the Spirit and Christ (cf., e.g., Rom 8:9–11; 2 Cor 3:17; Gal 4:6; Phil 1:19); in any event, given that Tertullian was a committed Trinitarian, the best explanation of this usage is that Tertullian is describing the “spiritual substance” that is the Son’s divine nature (cf. Wilhite, “Spirit of Prophecy,” 56–58).

45 See again Andresen, “Zur Entstehung,” 18–25; Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques*, 30–34; Slusser, “Exegetical Roots,” 464–465; Bates, *Birth*, 27–28, 164 n. 18.

Seeing, however, as no explanation has yet been offered for why Tertullian has assigned certain quotations to the Spirit and how this relates to his broader use of prosopological exegesis, this chapter will seek to provide just such a more nuanced understanding of how and why Tertullian utilized prosopological exegesis with respect to the Spirit.

### *The Spirit and Prosopological Exegesis in Prax. 11*

We are now equipped to return to the portion of *Prax.* 11 that concerns prosopological exegesis from the Spirit and to consider why Tertullian has attributed these particular quotations from the Old Testament to the Holy Spirit as well as the extent to which his understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit differs from those of his predecessors. Having already established the broader context of *Prax.* 11 above, we can return to our analysis of the critical lines that describe the prosopological speech of the Spirit in *Prax.* 11.7–8:

Consider also the Spirit speaking from a third person (*ex tertia persona*) concerning the Father and the Son: *The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet* [Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1)]. Again through Isaiah: *Thus says the Lord to my Lord Christ* [Isa 45:1]. Likewise through the same [prophet], to the Father concerning the Son: *Lord, who has believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? We have announced concerning him: like a young boy, like a root in a thirsty land, also there was no beauty or glory of his* [Isa 53:1–2].<sup>46</sup>

We may first observe that Tertullian sets out this section by invoking the technical language of prosopological exegesis, here with the Latin *ex persona* standing in place of the Greek ἐκ προσώπου. Like Justin and Irenaeus before him, Tertullian is clearly signaling to his readers that he is applying this ancient exegetical strategy to his reading of the Old Testament. There is, however, one terminological difference between Tertullian and his predecessors at precisely this point with major implications for this study. As seen in previous chapters, both Justin and Irenaeus described the Spirit's action of speaking prosopologically with the verbs θεολογέω and κυριολογέω, the terms used to portray the Spirit's unique capacity for providing testimony to the deity and lordship of the other divine persons. Here, however, we find a startling absence of any equivalent Latin terms.<sup>47</sup> To put this key point another way, for both Justin and Irenaeus, the

46 *Prax.* 11.7–8 (FC 34:146–148).

47 Equivalent Latin terms, as indicated in the Latin translation of Irenaeus's writings, seem to have involved the verb *appello* with the predicates *Deus* or *Dominus*.

clearest examples of the prosopological speech of the Spirit were employed for the specific purpose of testifying to the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son, whereas Tertullian gives no indication of any such concern.<sup>48</sup> In fact, Tertullian's rationale for providing prosopological speech from the Spirit is not immediately clear; this section of *Prax.* 11 is introduced with the call to "consider also the Spirit speaking from a third person concerning the Father and the Son," and concludes with Tertullian's claim that these examples demonstrate the distinction of the Trinity, with no intervening explanation or analysis of the logic or reasoning by which he is operating. It is only at the end of *Prax.* 11 that Tertullian's purpose is clear: together with instances of prosopological speech from the Father and the Son, these examples of the Spirit's speech demonstrate the distinctiveness of each of the three divine persons.

What, then, can we say about the purpose of the Spirit's prosopological speech as it relates to the characteristics of the quotations themselves? It is striking that previous scholarship has done little to attempt to answer the question of why Tertullian has selected Ps 110:1, Isa 45:1, and Isa 53:1–2 as his proof-texts. Immediately following this passage, Tertullian points out that these examples are but "few out of many" (*pauca de multis*), and although we might wish that Tertullian had indeed given further examples, Tertullian does give us enough help to make sense of the broader pattern he likely had in mind. Tertullian begins this sub-section by calling his readers to "consider also the Spirit speaking from a third person concerning the Father and the Son." Indeed, each of the following quotations can be plausibly read in this way according to Tertullian's understanding of the Triune God: Ps 110:1 and Isa 45:1 are both interpreted as the Spirit reporting the divine discourse of the Father speaking to the Son, though in the second case Tertullian does not bother to cite the Father's words themselves;<sup>49</sup> Isa 53:1–2 is then read as an example of the Spirit itself speaking to the Father concerning the Son. Thus, in each of these three quotations the Spirit's speech involves both the Father and the Son.

48 Interestingly, when Tertullian does show a concern to make this point in *Herm.* 3 (SC 439:82–88), he does not bring in the Spirit or any of the verses we have come to expect as proof-texts for this position but merely states that "Scripture" (in this case, the creation accounts of Gen 1–2) assigns the Creator the titles of "God" and "Lord."

49 This reading of Isa 45:1 is made possible by Tertullian following an inherited tradition of reading κυριω ("Lord," thus, "Christ") instead of the LXX's κύρω ("Cyrus"). Irenaeus cited the same form of Isa 45:1 alongside Ps 110:1 and Ps 2:7–8 in *Epid.* 49 (SC 406:154). Precedent for this reading is found in, e.g., *Barn.* 12.11 (LCL 25:60).

At this point, we must return to Justin and Irenaeus and note the continuities and discontinuities we find with Tertullian concerning these quotations. With respect to continuities, it is surely significant that Tertullian's predecessors also primarily portrayed the Spirit as speaking through dialogical passages in the Old Testament when both other divine persons were in view, allowing for the potential elevation of these texts from mere intra-divine testimony to what this study more narrowly calls Trinitarian testimony. For both Justin and Irenaeus, the key texts demonstrating this point were Ps 110:1, Gen 19:24, and Ps 45:6–7. Tertullian, however, retains the quotation of Ps 110:1 but jettisons the other two texts in favor of Isa 45:1 and Isa 53:1–2. How do we account for this discontinuity? As noted in the previous chapters of this book, Gen 19:24 and Ps 45:6–7 were, alongside Ps 110:1, important “two powers” texts for earlier Christian writers attempting to justify the worship of Christ alongside the worship of God the Father. The Isaianic passages, however, did not feature as strongly in these earlier debates, perhaps because they were judged more useful as messianic prophecies than as “two powers” texts.<sup>50</sup> This divorce of the Spirit's prosopological speech from key “two powers” texts such as Gen 19:24 and Ps 45:6–7 would prove significant; it appears that when Tertullian cut loose these two quotations, he likewise jettisoned the attached interpretation focusing on the Spirit's testifying function.<sup>51</sup> Indeed, when he does quote Gen 19:24 and Ps 45:6–7 in *Prax.* 13, the Spirit has completely dropped out of view, with no speaking subject identified. Interestingly, at least one of the verses Tertullian has added into the discussion of the Spirit's prosopological speech in *Prax.* 11.8, Isa 45:1, would have served as an equally good “two powers” text that also demonstrates the Spirit identifying the Son as “Lord,” but Tertullian does not point out this aspect of the quotation. Moreover, his final quotation, Isa 53:1–2, loses the “two powers” pattern altogether, with only the Father described as “Lord.” At best this passage could be understood as the Spirit providing intra-divine but not fully Trinitarian testimony, as was the case with the previous two quotations. Thus, in utilizing prosopological exegesis to make a subtly different point from that of his predecessors, Tertullian has selected different quotations, in the process losing their emphasis on the Spirit's testifying function.

50 As noted above, Irenaeus cited Isa 45:1 in *Epid.* 49 (SC 406:154). Justin, perhaps via Rom 10:16, quoted Isa 53:1 at *Dial.* 42.2 and 114.2 (PTS 47:139, 266), at which point he attributed it to the Holy Spirit as an inspiring secondary agent; cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 116.

51 Furthermore, we have seen that the non-dialogical passage Gen 19:24 was an uneasy fit with the dialogical passages in both Justin and Irenaeus; the removal of Gen 19:24 allows for a consistency in having exclusively dialogical texts placed in the mouth of the Spirit.

This brings us back, finally, to the central question of the extent to which Tertullian utilizes prosopological exegesis to describe the Spirit as providing Trinitarian testimony. Simply put, Tertullian appears to be assuming or leaving *implicit* this function of the Spirit whereas his predecessors made it *explicit*; while Justin and Irenaeus explained their interpretation of these passages with the language of Trinitarian testimony, the most that can be said about Tertullian is that this aspect of the Spirit's ministry is present, albeit in a diminished form, in the quotations themselves. For instance, in the first case of Ps 110:1, careful consideration of the quotation when read according to Tertullian's interpretation of the various characters involved leads inexorably to the conclusion that the Spirit is calling both the Father and the Son "Lord."<sup>52</sup> But because Tertullian only interprets this quotation with the description that the Spirit is "speaking concerning" the Father and the Son, this testifying work of the Spirit, so important for Tertullian's predecessors, is considerably diminished. The conclusion of *Prax.* 11, however, suggests that Tertullian understands a different form of testimony to be at work: these various quotations, per Tertullian's polemical purposes in this treatise, serve to establish the uniqueness of each divine person.<sup>53</sup> Apart from testifying to a different aspect of the nature of the Godhead (the uniqueness of each person rather than the deity and lordship of the persons) than that encountered previously in this study, the Spirit's "testimony" is not construed as special or distinct relative to that of the other divine persons, who also testify to the distinctiveness of the other divine persons.

The irony of this is that while I have argued that the Spirit's prosopological speech endowed the Spirit with a greater degree of personhood in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus, Tertullian, building upon this very foundation, goes even farther than his predecessors in making explicit the personhood of the Spirit even as he takes a step in severing the link between the Spirit and the very thing that contributed to the Spirit's emerging personhood. As we will see below, however, Tertullian's broader theological system does provide for the Spirit to still have a role in testifying to the other persons of the Trinity in the sense we have been tracing throughout this book, but it appears to be largely unrelated to how the Spirit testifies through prosopological exegesis in *Prax.* 11.7–8. With these observations in mind, we expand our horizons beyond *Prax.* 11 to exam-

52 The same logic applies to Isa 45:1 and Isa 53:1–2; for details, see Kyle R. Hughes, "The Spirit Speaks: Pneumatological Innovation in the Scriptural Exegesis of Justin and Tertullian," *VC* 69 (2015): 467–468.

53 *Prax.* 11.9 (FC 34:148). Rankin ("Tertullian's Vocabulary," 30) in fact calls these scripture passages "testimonies."



ine how Tertullian utilizes prosopological exegesis elsewhere and thus whether our preliminary conclusions are in need of any modification.

### Differentiating Tertullian's Use of Prosopological Exegesis

We have observed that Tertullian in *Prax.* 11 sets out quotations from the Old Testament that he ascribes, in turn, to the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. We have also observed that, at least according to *Prax.* 11, the Spirit's speech has a fundamental difference from that of the Father or the Son. Whereas the latter two persons have a strictly two-way communication (with no reference to the Spirit), the Spirit's discourse involves *both* of the other two members of the Trinity.<sup>54</sup> In this section, we cast our vision beyond *Prax.* 11 to identify the extent to which this exclusive function of the Spirit holds across Tertullian's other writings. In addition, a more thorough examination of Tertullian's use of prosopological exegesis is necessary to determine if any form of intra-divine, much less Trinitarian, testimony is ascribed to either of the other divine persons, or if its implicit ascription to the Spirit is unique as was the case with Justin and Irenaeus.

#### *Prosopological Exegesis from the Father*

In his overview of prosopological exegesis (*Prax.* 11), Tertullian gives two examples of prosopological speech from the Father, both from Isaiah (42:1 and 49:6); the first is interpreted as the Father speaking concerning the Son and the second as the Father speaking to the Son.<sup>55</sup> As such, in *Prax.* 11.10, Tertullian can declare that he has found evidence of statements made "by the Father con-

54 Rondeau, *Les Commentaires Patristiques*, 33 n. 41, notes the same phenomenon: "Que l'Esprit soit la troisième personne divine non parce qu'il est en fonction de troisième personne grammaticale, mais parce qu'il est en fonction de troisième locuteur, montre que, bien que Tertullien lui-même fasse interférer le schéma grammatical dont les "trois personnes" offraient une analogie séduisante, l'exégèse prosopologique porte fondamentalement sur le locuteur (et sur le 'tu', qui est un locuteur potentiel)."

55 Evans (*Praxeas*, 254–255) complains that these verses "have only been made to suit Tertullian's purpose by strained application," and notes with respect to Isa 42:1 that Tertullian's reading is closer to the Hebrew than the LXX but that Tertullian was wrong to translate *παῖς* with *filius*; Justin at *Dial.* 123.8 (PTS 47:283–284), interestingly, followed the LXX reading but still interpreted it as the Father speaking about the Son. As for Isa 49:6, Tertullian again translates *παῖς* with *filius*. Justin quoted Isa 49:6, also interpreting it christologically, at *Dial.* 121.4 (PTS 47:280). Irenaeus did not quote Isa 42:1, but quoted Isa 49:6 at *Epid.* 50 (SC 406:156).

cerning the Son or to the Son.” Examining both the quotations provided as well as Tertullian’s explicit statement on the matter, Tertullian seems to limit the Father’s prosopological speech to that which in some capacity involves the Son (and the Son only). As was the case with Irenaeus, Tertullian quotes extensively from the Old Testament and often introduces a quotation not involving other divine persons as the words of “God” or “the Creator,” but as these are irrelevant for this study, they will again simply be disregarded.<sup>56</sup> As such, a search across all of Tertullian’s writings for Old Testament quotations ascribed to the first person of the Trinity that are either addressed to or explicitly concern another divine person yields the following instances, summarized below in Table 12:<sup>57</sup>

TABLE 12 *Intra-divine passages ascribed to God/the Father/the Creator in the writings of Tertullian*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Adv. Jud.</i> 7.2 (FC 75:202)	Isa 45:1	God the Father	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Adv. Jud.</i> 12.1–2 (FC 75:276–278)	Ps 2:7–8; Isa 42:6–7	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Adv. Jud.</i> 14.12 (FC 75:302–304)	Ps 2:7–8	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Herm.</i> 18.3 (SC 439:128)	Ps 45:1 (LXX 44:2)	God	describes the generation of the Son
<i>Res.</i> 6.4 (CCSL 2:928)	Gen 1:26	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (creation)
<i>Res.</i> 10.2 (CCSL 2:933)	Joel 2:28 (LXX 3:1)	God	describes the sending of the Spirit (to Gentiles)

56 As noted throughout this book, it is arguable whether any such instances should be counted as prosopological exegesis in the first place. These instances are most common in books 4 and 5 of *Marc.*, as Tertullian repeatedly identifies sayings from the Old Testament as the words of “the Creator.”

57 As with the other tables in this section, examples from Tertullian’s works will be presented according to their supposed chronological order (following Barnes, *Tertullian*, 55), from earliest to latest in composition. For an alternative chronology, see Jean-Claude Fredouille, *Tertullien et la conversion de la culture antique* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1972), 487–488, though the order of the most important texts we are considering (*Adv. Jud.*, *Marc.*, *Prax.*) is the same for both Barnes and Fredouille.

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Marc.</i> 2.4.1 (SC 368:34)	Ps 45:1 (LXX 44:2)	God	describes the generation of the Son
<i>Marc.</i> 3.17.1 (SC 399:150–152)	Isa 52:14	the Father	tells the Son about his coming passion
<i>Marc.</i> 3.20.3–5 (SC 399:172–174)	Ps 2:7–8; Isa 42:6–7, 55:5	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Marc.</i> 3.20.5 (SC 399:174)	Isa 55:4	the Father	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Marc.</i> 4.14.1 (SC 456:174)	Ps 45:1 (LXX 44:2)	the Creator	describes the generation of the Son
<i>Marc.</i> 4.22.8 (SC 456:284)	Ps 2:7; Isa 50:10	the Father	divine testimony to Jesus at his baptism
<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.8 (SC 456:300)	Isa 42:2–3	the Judge (that is, the Creator)	describes the ministry of the Son (mercy)
<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.10 (SC 456:312)	Ps 91:13 (LXX 90:13)	the Creator	gives instructions to the Son (reign)
<i>Marc.</i> 4.25.5, 9 (SC 456:318–320)	Isa 49:6; Ps 2:8	the Creator	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Marc.</i> 4.39.11 (SC 456:486)	Ps 2:8	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.4 (SC 456:508)	Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1)	the Creator	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.2 (PL 2:505C)	Isa 42:6	the Creator	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.4 (PL 2:507C)	Isa 2:2	the Creator	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.4 (PL 2:507D)	Joel 2:28 (LXX 3:1)	the Creator	describes the sending of the Spirit (to Gentiles)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.5 (PL 2:513C)	Isa 8:14	the Creator	describes the ministry of the Son (to Jews)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.6 (PL 2:516C)	Isa 28:16	the Creator	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.8 (PL 2:520B)	Gen 1:26	the Creator	gives instructions to the Son (creation)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.8 (PL 2:521C)	Joel 2:28–29 (LXX 3:1–2)	the Creator	describes the sending of the Spirit (to Gentiles)

TABLE 12 *Intra-divine passages ascribed to God/the Father/the Creator (cont.)*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.9 (PL 2:524B–525A)	Ps 110:1–4 (LXX 109:1–4)	God	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.11 (PL 2:530C)	Joel 2:28 (LXX 3:1)	the Creator	describes the sending of the Spirit (to Gentiles)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.11 (PL 2:532B)	Isa 49:6	the Creator	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.17 (PL 2:546A)	Ps 2:8, 110:1 (LXX 109:1)	the Creator	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Prax.</i> 4.2 (FC 34:114)	Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1)	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Prax.</i> 7.1 (FC 34:124)	Ps 45:1 (LXX 44:2)	the Father	describes the generation of the Son
<i>Prax.</i> 7.2 (FC 34:124)	Ps 2:7, 110:3 (LXX 109:3)	the Father	tells the Son of his generation
<i>Prax.</i> 11.2 (FC 34:144)	Ps 45:1 (LXX 44:2)	God/the Father	describes the generation of the Son
<i>Prax.</i> 11.3 (FC 34:144)	Ps 2:7	the Father	tells the Son of his generation
<i>Prax.</i> 11.5 (FC 34:146)	Isa 42:1	the Father	describes the ministry of the Son (to Gentiles)
<i>Prax.</i> 11.5 (FC 34:146)	Isa 49:6	the Father	gives instructions to the Son (Gentile mission)
<i>Prax.</i> 12.1–2 (FC 34:150)	Gen 1:26, 3:22	the Father	gives instructions to the Son and the Spirit (creation)
<i>Prax.</i> 19.4 (FC 34:190)	Isa 44:25–26	God/the Father	describes the Son's presence at creation

As this chart indicates, the vast majority of instances of intra-divine speech assigned prosopologically to the Father come not from *Prax.* but from books 4 and 5 of Tertullian's *Against Marcion*, which are in effect verse-by-verse commentaries on the Gospel of Luke and the Pauline corpus.<sup>58</sup> Throughout this

<sup>58</sup> Namely, Galatians, 1–2 Corinthians, Romans, 1–2 Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians,

and Tertullian's other works, we find many further examples of the principle set out in *Prax.* 11.10. Thus, Tertullian gives further examples of the Father making statements concerning the Son; in addition to Isa 42:1 (*Prax.* 11.5), in which the Father describes the Son's incarnate ministry of judgment and redemption, Tertullian finds other instances from the book of Isaiah (2:2, 8:14, 28:16, 42:2–3, 45:1, 55:4) that he interprets in the same manner. Tertullian also finds evidence of the Father speaking concerning the Son's generation through a christological reading of Ps 45:1,<sup>59</sup> the Son's presence at creation (Isa 44:25–26), and the Son's authority to rule over all living creatures (Ps 91:13), all of which appear to be innovations beyond either Justin or Irenaeus before him.

Similarly, Tertullian gives additional examples of the Father making statements to the Son beyond Isa 49:6 (*Prax.* 11.5). As was the case with Irenaeus, Tertullian identifies several Old Testament dialogical passages as instances of the Father instructing the Son concerning the latter's promised rule over the nations. Like Irenaeus, Tertullian cites Ps 2:(7–)8 and Ps 110:1(–4), alongside Isa 49:6, as examples of the Father speaking to the Son, but Tertullian goes further in also identifying additional Isaianic texts, Isa 42:6(–7) and 55:5, that fit this theme. Tertullian also finds examples of the Father speaking to the Son concerning his generation (Ps 2:7) and his coming passion (Isa 52:14). In sum, Tertullian confirms and expands the prosopological readings of Irenaeus with respect to the speech of the Father by emphasizing how the Father speaks to and concerning the Son when it concerns the Son's incarnate ministry, particularly in relation to his mission to the Gentiles.

Interestingly, though in *Prax.* 11 Tertullian does not mention the Father speaking to the Spirit or concerning the Spirit, the rest of his writings do provide evidence of such readings. Thus, Tertullian reads Joel 2:28 as the Father speaking about how he will send the Spirit, and interprets Gen 1:26 as the Father speaking to the Spirit and the Son (though, in some instances, Tertullian will

---

Philippians, and Philemon; the Pastorals and Hebrews are noticeably absent, though the implications for the authorship of these works are beyond the scope of this study. On Tertullian's general method of biblical exegesis in *Marc.* books 4 and 5, see Bryan Mark Litfin, "Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*: A Case Study in 'Regular Hermeneutics'" (PhD diss., The University of Virginia, 2002), 56–174, though prosopological exegesis is never directly discussed.

59 Evans (*Praxeas*, 226–227) suggests that Tertullian's christological reading of Ps 45:1 came about because of the history of interpreting Ps 45:6–7 as referring to the Son; cf. Heb 1:8–9; Justin, *Dial.* 56.14 (PTS 47:164); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:66). Evans criticizes Theophilus as being the first to read λόγος in Ps 45:1 as referring to the Word instead of the subject matter of the psalm itself; cf. Theophilus, *Autol.* 2.10.2 (PTS 44:53).

read this as the Father speaking solely to the Son).<sup>60</sup> As with Irenaeus, Gen 1:26 is the only text in which the Father speaks prosopologically with both of the other divine persons in view, but the Father is not in any way testifying to the other persons, for he is simply instructing them in the work of creation. Tertullian's repeated reference to the Father's sending of the Spirit in Joel 2:28 is, we may suspect, a logical consequence of his belief in the importance of the ministry of the Paraclete.

Only in one place does Tertullian come close to ascribing to the Father a role in speaking through the Old Testament to testify to another divine person. In *Marc.* 4.22.8, Tertullian describes how the Father provides "new testimony (*testimonium*) concerning the Son" at Jesus's transfiguration (Luke 9:35) by declaring Jesus to be his Son, which Tertullian claims is a fulfillment of the prior testimony of the Father in Ps 2:7 and Isa 50:10.<sup>61</sup> As noted in the introduction of this book, the writers of the New Testament would have understood references to the Father's description of Jesus as his "son" as examples of the *topos* of divine testimony and not intra-divine testimony as we have identified it. By Tertullian's time, however, the royal usage of "son" had fully given way to a more ontological understanding of "Son,"<sup>62</sup> and thus a case could be made that this should now be read as an instance of intra-divine testimony from the Father concerning the Son. I caution against classifying this as such, however, noting the context of this passage, in which Tertullian is recounting Jesus's transfiguration and the voice from heaven that identifies Jesus as God's Son. Tertullian's emphasis on the Father's "testimony" is not, as in the case of the intra-divine testimony of the Spirit, focused upon the ascription of deity or lordship to the Son; rather, his focus falls on how the arrival of Jesus marks the fulfillment of the Father's prophetic promise to send his Son. Certainly Tertullian could have taken the Father's testimony in another direction by equating "Son" with "Lord" and "God," but his emphasis on how the Father has fulfilled his promise to send his Son points more in the direction of the *topos* of divine

60 Irenaeus also alternated between describing Gen 1:26 as the words of the Father to the Son and the Spirit at *Haer.* 4.pref.4, 4.20.1 (SC 100:390, 626) and as the words of the Father to the Son alone at *Haer.* 5.1.3, 5.15.4 (SC 153:28, 210); *Epid.* 55 (SC 406:162).

61 *Marc.* 4.22.8 (SC 456:284): *patris nouum testimonium super filio*. Ernest Evans, ed. and trans., *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 1:xx, notes that this work draws extensively on both Justin and Irenaeus.

62 We can see this process at work as early as some of the later New Testament writings (e.g., the Fourth Gospel) with the emergence of Gentile Christianity. Cf. James D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 3rd ed. (London: SCM, 2006), 47–52.

testimony and not intra-divine testimony as identified herein. This focus on the fulfillment of the Father's promises, moreover, seems to be what Tertullian also has in mind in key passages describing the relationship between the Father and the Son that do not involve prosopological exegesis.<sup>63</sup>

In sum, therefore, when the Father speaks prosopologically through the words of the Old Testament, it is almost always to instruct or to describe the ministry of one of the other divine persons (usually the Son); intra-divine or Trinitarian testimony is never in view.

### *Prosopological Exegesis from the Son*

In *Prax.* 11.6, Tertullian identifies Isa 61:1, Ps 71:18, and Ps 3:1 as instances of the Son's prosopological speech. The first example is interpreted as the Son speaking concerning the Father, while the two texts from the Psalter are both read as the words of the Son to the Father. Thus, in parallel with the case of the Father, Tertullian can conclude in *Prax.* 11.10 that the Old Testament provides evidence of statements made "by the Son concerning the Father or to the Father." Indeed, Tertullian claims in *Prax.* 11.7 that "nearly all the psalms sustain the person of Christ and represent the Son speaking to the Father—that is, Christ to God." Again, therefore, if we follow both the quotations provided as well as Tertullian's own statement on the matter, Tertullian appears to limit the Son's prosopological speech to that which in some capacity involves the Father (and the Father only). As in the case of the Father, those passages that Tertullian ascribes to the second person of the Trinity that are merely examples of human-directed speech and do not involve other divine persons will be set aside as simply irrelevant for this study.<sup>64</sup> Following these parameters, Table 13 below

63 E.g., in *Marc.* 3.2.1 (SC 399:58) the Father "acknowledges" (*profiteretur*) and "testifies to" (*testaretur*) the Son, likely a reference to the Father's prophetic words concerning the coming of the incarnate Son; in *Marc.* 3.6.6 (SC 399:80) the Father "announces" (*adnuntiatur*) the Son to men. Likewise, the Father's words to the Son concerning the Son's generation, as at *Prax.* 7.2, 11.3 (FC 34:124, 144) are not interpreted using testimony language, instead focusing on the distinction between the Father and the Son, nor do the quotations themselves use any language of ascribing deity or lordship.

64 More specifically, as was the case with Irenaeus, those instances in which the second person of the Trinity is identified as the speaker of Old Testament passages that in their original setting were simply the words of "God" or "the Lord" to human beings or descriptions of his passion without a clear audience are excluded; cf., in addition to extensive usages throughout *Marc.* book 4 (SC 456), *Marc.* 3.5.2, 3.6.7, 3.16.5, 3.19.5 (SC 399:72, 82, 146–148, 166–168); *Adv. Jud.* 9.23, 10.4 (FC 75:246, 254–256). Following Justin and other early Christian writers, Tertullian identifies the Son as the subject of the Old Testament theophanies and many of the words of the Old Testament, as at *Marc.* 2.27.3–5, 4.13.1 (SC

provides all of the instances in Tertullian's writings of prosopological speech from the second person of the Trinity involving other divine persons:

TABLE 13 *Intra-divine passages ascribed to Christ/the Son/Wisdom in the writings of Tertullian*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Adv. Jud.</i> 10.13 (FC 75:264)	Ps 22:21 (LXX 21:22)	Christ	requests the Father save him from death
<i>Adv. Jud.</i> 13.27 (FC 75:294)	Ps 59:11 (LXX 58:12)	Christ	requests the Father disperse his enemies
<i>Herm.</i> 18.1 (SC 439:126)	Prov 8:27–31	Wisdom	describes his generation and presence with the Father at creation
<i>Herm.</i> 20.1 (SC 439:132)	Prov 8:22	the Wisdom of God	describes his generation from the Father
<i>Herm.</i> 32.2 (SC 439:164–166)	Prov 8:24, 27–28	Wisdom	describes his presence with the Father at creation
<i>Carn. Chr.</i> 20.4–5 (CCSL 2:909)	Ps 22:9–10 (LXX 21:10–11)	Christ the Lord	speaks to the Father of his nativity
<i>Marc.</i> 2.27.5 (SC 368:162–164)	Exod 33:20	Christ	describes the Father as unable to be seen
<i>Marc.</i> 3.19.5 (SC 399:168)	Ps 22:21 (LXX 21:22)	Christ	requests the Father save him from death
<i>Marc.</i> 3.22.6 (SC 399:192)	Ps 22:22, 25 (LXX 21:23, 26), 68:26 (LXX 67:27)	Christ	speaks to the Father about his priestly role
<i>Marc.</i> 3.23.4 (SC 399:196)	Ps 59:11 (LXX 58:12)	Christ	requests the Father disperse his enemies
<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.7 (SC 456:146–148)	Isa 61:10	Christ	rejoices in the Father

368:160–164; SC 456:166), though Tertullian struggles to still preserve the transcendence of the Son, as at *Prax.* 14–16 (FC 34:162–180); see further Evans, *Praxeas*, 269–274; idem, *Adversus Marcionem*, 1:161. To use the language of the Ayres-Barnes schema, this represents a rejection of Jewish-Christian pneumatologies and thus marks the beginning of a new stage in the development of early Christian pneumatology. In the chart above, where the Son is identified with Wisdom, I retain the male pronoun.



Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Marc.</i> 4.13.2 (SC 456:168)	Ps 22:2 (LXX 21:3), 3:4 (LXX 3:5)	Christ	prays to the Father
<i>Marc.</i> 4.14.13 (SC 456:182)	Isa 61:1	Christ	describes the Father's anointing
<i>Marc.</i> 4.39.7 (SC 456:480)	Isa 50:4	Christ	describes the Father's anointing
<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.6 (SC 456:516)	Ps 31:5 (LXX 30:6)	Christ	requests the Father receive his spirit
<i>Prax.</i> 6.1–2 (FC 34:120–122)	Prov 8:22–25, 27–30	Wisdom	describes his generation from the Father
<i>Prax.</i> 7.1 (FC 34:124)	Prov 8:22, 27	Wisdom/the Son	describes his generation from the Father
<i>Prax.</i> 11.6 (FC 34:146)	Isa 61:1	the Son	describes the Father's anointing
<i>Prax.</i> 11.6 (FC 34:146)	Ps 71:18 (LXX 70:18), 3:1 (LXX 3:2)	the Son	requests the Father save him and disperse his enemies
<i>Prax.</i> 19.2, 5–6 (FC 34:188–190)	Prov 8:27; Isa 44:24, 41:4	Wisdom/the Son	describes his presence with the Father at creation
<i>Prax.</i> 22.5 (FC 34:204–206)	Jer 1:9; Isa 50:4	the Son	describes the Father's anointing
<i>Prax.</i> 23.9 (FC 34:214)	Isa 50:4	the Son	describes the Father's anointing

As was the case with the prosopological speech of the Father, Tertullian's overview in *Prax.* 11.10 establishes a helpful pattern with respect to the prosopological speech of the Son. Beginning with the Son's statements concerning the Father, Tertullian adds to Isa 61:1 (his example in *Prax.* 11.6, in which the Son celebrates the Father's anointing) other texts in which he understands the Son to be describing the Father's anointing (Jer 1:9; Isa 50:4, 61:10). To this we may add a single instance in which the Son is said to have remarked on the Father's invisibility (Exod 33:20). As for instances of the Son speaking to the Father, in contrast to Irenaeus, who never explicitly marked the Father as the audience of the Son's speech, Tertullian does so quite often. These quotations most commonly present the Son as crying out to the Father, presumably over the course

of his passion, imploring him to disperse his enemies (Ps 3:1, 59:11), save him from death (Ps 22:21, 71:18), and receive his spirit (Ps 31:5). The Son also prays to the Father (Ps 3:4, 22:2), speaks to the Father concerning his priestly role in leading worship (Ps 22:22, 22:25, 68:26), and talks to the Father about his nativity (Ps 22:9–10).

Perhaps the most interesting subset of the Son's speech is that in which the Son speaks concerning his generation from the Father and his involvement in the creation of the world. As we recall, Irenaeus assigned Wisdom's speech (Prov 8:22–31) to the Spirit,<sup>65</sup> a point which led Michel René Barnes to identify this as a central example of Irenaeus's broader "high" pneumatology inspired by various Jewish approaches to the Spirit.<sup>66</sup> Tertullian, however, has identified the Son, and not the Spirit, as the ultimate referent of the Wisdom character who was generated by the Father and was present with the Father at creation.<sup>67</sup> In any event, none of these instances involve any form of testimony to other beings, whether human or divine.

### *Prosopological Exegesis from the Spirit*

Finally, we return to Tertullian's understanding of the Spirit's prosopological speech. As observed above, in *Prax.* 11.7–8 Tertullian clearly identifies the Spirit as capable of speaking from its own *persona*, though he downplays the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony insofar as the Spirit's testimony to the lordship of the other divine persons is only implicit in the quotations themselves. As demonstrated above, in each of the three quotations Tertullian presents as examples he argues that all three divine persons are involved in the conversation; thus the Spirit can speak concerning the Father and the Son (Ps 110:1; Isa 45:1) or to the Father concerning the Son (Isa 53:1). As has been our pattern, for the sake of thoroughness all instances in which the Spirit is identified as the speaker of an Old Testament quotation will be examined even though Tertullian appears to limit the Spirit's prosopological speech to those occasions in which the other two divine persons are in view; the results are summarized in Table 14 on the following page.

65 See again *Haer.* 4.20.3 (SC 100:632).

66 Barnes, "Beginning and End," 171–174.

67 See esp. *Herm.* 18.3, 20.4, 32.2 (SC 439:128, 134, 164–166); *Prax.* 6.1–2, 7.1, 19.2 (FC 34:120–122, 124, 188). Barnes, "Beginning and End," 181, suggests that Tertullian is reinterpreting Prov 8:22–31 in light of Ps 33:6 and John 1:3, thus "the exegetical basis for a theology of the Holy Spirit as creator is under-cut: the key passages are now understood to refer to the pre-existent Son in support of a theology of His distinct and personal existence before and during His Incarnation."

TABLE 14 *Old Testament passages ascribed to the Spirit in the writings of Tertullian*

Passage	Citation	Marked (non-human) speaker	Theme(s)
<i>Idol.</i> 14.6 (CCSL 2:1115)	Isa 1:14	the Holy Spirit	criticizes the Jews
<i>Adv. Jud.</i> 5.4 (FC 75:196)	Mal 1:10–11	the Spirit	criticizes the Jews
<i>Herm.</i> 22.1 (SC 439:138)	Gen 1:11–24	the Holy Spirit	describes creation
<i>Marc.</i> 3.24.11 (SC 399:212)	Isa 60:8	the Spirit	marvels at the saints rising to meet the Son
<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.7 (SC 456:148)	Isa 49:18	the Spirit	speaks to the Son concerning the church
<i>Marc.</i> 5.11 (PL 2:532C)	Ps 4:6 (LXX 4:7)	the Spirit	intra-divine testimony (the Son is Lord)
<i>Marc.</i> 5.17 (PL 2:546A)	Ps 8:6 (LXX 8:7)	the Spirit	intra-divine testimony (the Son is Lord)
<i>Prax.</i> 11.7–8 (FC 34:146–148)	Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1); Isa 45:1	the Spirit	Trinitarian testimony (Father and Son are Lord)
<i>Prax.</i> 11.8 (FC 34:148)	Isa 53:1–2	the Spirit	intra-divine testimony (the Father is Lord)
<i>Prax.</i> 14.10 (FC 34:168)	Lam 4:20	the Spirit	intra-divine testimony (the Son is Lord)

That the Spirit is the inspiring force behind all the words of Scripture was a given for Tertullian as it was for his predecessors,<sup>68</sup> and indeed in the quotations assigned to the Spirit in Tertullian's earlier writings, before his full embrace of the New Prophecy, the Spirit appears simply to be functioning in

68 For statements about the Spirit's general role in inspiring the Old Testament, see *Apol.* 20.4 (CCSL 1:122); *An.* 11.4 (CCSL 2:797); *Carn. Chr.* 23.6 (CCSL 2:915); *Idol.* 4.5, 15.6 (CCSL 2:1104, 116); *Adv. Jud.* 9.23, 10.19 (FC 75:248, 268); *Or.* 2.3, 22.1 (CCSL 1:258, 269); *Marc.* 4.40.6 (SC 456:500–502). That Tertullian clearly understands the writings of the New Testament to also be inspired by the Holy Spirit, see *Virg.* 4.3 (CCSL 2:1213); *Ux.* 2.2.4 (CCSL 1:386); *Cult. fem.* 2.2.5 (CCSL 1:355); *Jejun.* 15.1 (CCSL 2:1273); *Praescr.* 6.6 (SC 46:95); *Res.* 24.8 (CCSL 2:952); *Pat.* 7.5 (SC 310:84); *Marc.* 5.7 (PL 2:517C); *Or.* 20.2 (CCSL 1:268). Cf. Wilhite, "Spirit of Prophecy," 63–64.

this secondary, inspiring role (Gen 1:11–24; Isa 1:14; Mal 1:10–11). Though these quotations are in each case explicitly assigned to the Spirit without any mention of an intermediary, nothing in these texts suggests anything beyond mere inspiration.<sup>69</sup> Interestingly, in his writings from after his Montanist turn, Tertullian increasingly begins to portray the Spirit as speaking through the Scriptures as a primary speaking agent. Here, then, we have evidence of Tertullian's "conversion" to the New Prophecy altering his pneumatology, specifically insofar as he underscores the personhood of the Spirit by means of his presentation of its full ability to speak prosopologically through the Old Testament.<sup>70</sup> Thus, Wilhite's claims that Tertullian's Montanism did not in general affect his conception of the Spirit's personhood and that *Prax.* in particular is not concerned with the Spirit's personhood are both, as a result of a look at Tertullian's use of prosopological exegesis, in need of some modification.<sup>71</sup>

Having already looked at *Prax.* 11.7–8, we can now briefly consider each of the four examples from *Marc.* as well as the case of *Prax.* 14.10. The first instance in which the Spirit is likely portrayed as a primary speaking agent is *Marc.* 3.24.11. Referring to when followers of Christ will be caught up into the clouds to meet the Lord (cf. 1 Thess 4:17), Tertullian writes, "Thus the Spirit marvels at those who by that ascent are going to heavenly kingdoms, saying, *They fly, and they are the ones who fly like clouds and like little doves towards me*—that is to say, simply like doves."<sup>72</sup> This citation of Isa 60:8 presents the Spirit as a speaker in its own right, observing and commenting on the saints' arrival in the heavenly kingdom. Given that these people are ascending to meet Christ, one might expect the Son to be identified as the speaker of this text; however, Tertullian's emphasis on the word "doves," perhaps recalling the use of this bird as a symbol of the Spirit (cf. Mark 1:10 pars.), makes this connection understandable. In any

69 As an illustration of how Tertullian sees these texts as merely inspired by the Spirit, he in *Marc.* 4.12.4 (SC 456:156) assigns Isa 1:14 to either the Father or the Son (the Latin is unclear); cf. *Idol.* 14.6 (CCSL 2:1115). Indeed, Tertullian elsewhere presents the Spirit as speaking in the *persona* of another person, e.g., in the person of the Father at *Adv. Jud.* 9.23 (FC 75:248) or in the person of the apostles at *Marc.* 4.22.12 (SC 456:286).

70 Though she does not invoke the language of prosopological exegesis, Stegman ("Tertullian's Doctrine," 222–225) makes the same basic point.

71 See again Wilhite, "Spirit of Prophecy," 52, 59.

72 *Marc.* 3.24.11 (SC 399:212): Ita per illum ascensum ad caelestia regna tendentes miratur spiritus dicens: [*Volant uelut*] *Qui sunt hi qui ut nubes uolant, et uelut pulli columbarum ad me, scilicet simpliciter ut columbae.* Other editions, e.g. Evans (1:250), read *milvi* for *hi qui*, but see the edition of Braun for defense of his emendation, which more closely reflects Isa 60:8.

event, though the Son is likely present in this scene that the Spirit is describing, the Son's presence is not clear enough for us to categorize this as an instance of intra-divine dialogue. Still, this passage is significant for our purposes as the Spirit has finally risen to the level of a primary speaking agent, setting the stage for further developments.

Next, in *Marc.* 4.11.7, Tertullian is interpreting Luke 5:27–39, which recounts the calling of Levi and a controversy over Jesus's disciples' lack of fasting. Noting that Jesus refers to himself as "the bridegroom" in Luke 5:34–35, Tertullian uses the reading technique of word association to interpret this dominical saying in light of Old Testament passages that also speak of a bridegroom.<sup>73</sup> Having cited Ps 19:5–6 and Isa 61:10, Tertullian introduces a quotation of Isa 49:18 with the following words: "For indeed [Christ] counts the church as in himself, concerning which the same Spirit [says] to him, *You shall place them all on yourself, as an ornament on a bride.*"<sup>74</sup> Here Tertullian interprets this verse as the Spirit telling the Son about how the latter will summon the church to himself. Interestingly, this interpretation immediately follows Tertullian's quotation of Isa 61:10, which is read as first-person speech from the Son concerning the Father. It may be expected, then, that this speech was interpreted as the words of the Father to the Son (and indeed, elsewhere Tertullian has interpreted Isa 49:6 as such; cf. *Prax.* 11.5). It is, therefore, simply unclear why Tertullian has assigned this verse to the Spirit on this occasion. In any event, the Spirit is now not only presented as a primary speaking agent but also as directly conversing with another divine person, making this an example of intra-divine dialogue involving the Spirit, albeit without any form of testimony. It may also be noted that though Tertullian's presentation of the Spirit's prosopological speech in *Prax.* 11.7–8 seemed to suggest that the Spirit's prosopological speech (at least as it involves intra-divine dialogue) would always involve both of the other divine persons, this example demonstrates that this pattern does not hold across all of Tertullian's writings.

In our next passage, *Marc.* 5.11, Tertullian is exegeting key points from the first chapters of 2 Corinthians, here focusing on 2 Cor 4:6, which Tertullian quotes as, "Because God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, has shined in our hearts to [give] the light of the knowledge of his glory in the

73 On word association, see further John J. O'Keefe and R.R. Reno, *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 50–56; for example, see Origen's analysis of the use of ἀρχή throughout the Bible to interpret John 1:1 in *Comm. John* 1.90–124 (SC 120:106–124).

74 *Marc.* 4.11.7 (SC 456:148): In se enim et ecclesiam deputat, de qua idem spiritus ad ipsum: *Et circumpones tibi omnes eos, uelut ornamentum sponsae.*

countenance of Christ.”<sup>75</sup> Tertullian then again uses word association to interpret this verse by bringing in other biblical texts including the words “light” and “darkness.” After identifying the Father as the one who created the light (Gen 1:3) and set Christ to be a light to the Gentiles living in darkness (Isa 49:6, 9:2), Tertullian adds a reference to Ps 4:6: “To [Christ], the Spirit replies in the psalm by foreknowledge of the future, *The light of your countenance, O Lord, has been shown above us.*”<sup>76</sup> Tertullian goes on to identify Christ as the countenance (*persona*) of God, pulling in 2 Cor 4:4, allowing him to make the point that Christ is not opposed to the Creator God.<sup>77</sup> Thus, in this instance we have the Spirit speaking to the Son as a primary speaking agent in the context of distinguishing the Son from the Father; as in *Prax.* 11, the primary aim of Tertullian’s use of prosopological exegesis is to distinguish the divine persons. Furthermore, that the Spirit in this quotation calls the Son (and only the Son) “Lord” matches the kind of implicit intra-divine testimony observed in *Prax.* 11.8 with the quotation of Isa 53:1–2.

In the next instance, *Marc.* 5.17, Tertullian is interpreting selected issues from the first two chapters of Ephesians. In his exposition of Paul’s reference to Christ’s inheritance of the saints (Eph 1:18), Tertullian pulls in two Old Testament texts which he reads prosopologically as the Father speaking to the Son concerning this inheritance (Ps 2:8, 110:1). Tertullian then adds, “And also elsewhere the Spirit [says] to the Father concerning the Son, *You have subjected all things beneath his feet.*”<sup>78</sup> This is a reference to Ps 8:6, and though neither Justin nor Irenaeus linked Ps 8:6 with Ps 2:8 or Ps 110:1 (likely because of the change in speaker), New Testament precedents and the particular lexical parallels between Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:6 made this an easy target for Tertullian’s word association.<sup>79</sup> Though “Lord” does not appear in this quotation, the content of the quotation (the Son’s rule over all things) clearly ascribes lordship to the Son

75 *Marc.* 5.11.11 (CCSL 1:698): *quoniam deus, qui dixit ex tenebris lucem lucescere, reluxit in cordibus nostris ad inlumenationem agnitionis [gloriae] suae in persona Christi.*

76 *Marc.* 5.11.12 (CCSL 1:698): Cui respondent spiritus in psalmo, ex providentia futuri: *significatum est [inquit] super nos lumen personae tuae, domine.*

77 As Evans (*Adversus Marcionem*, 2:583) notes, Tertullian is likely playing on both “face” and “person” as the meanings of *persona* here.

78 *Marc.* 5.17.6 (CCSL 1:714): et alibi spiritus ad patrem de filio: *omnia subiecisti sub pedibus eius.*

79 On the “fusion” of Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:6 in early Christianity, see Aquila H.I. Lee, *From Messiah to Preexistent Son: Jesus’ Self-Consciousness and Early Christian Exegesis of Messianic Psalms*, WUNT 2/192 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 216–217. Cf. 1 Cor 15:25–27; Eph 1:20–22; 1 Pet 3:22.

(and only the Son), and as such we can again characterize this as similar to the intra-divine testimony found in the previous instance and in *Prax.* 11.8.

Finally, in *Prax.* 14, Tertullian is focused on demonstrating the distinction and the unity of the Father and the Son, drawing on word association to draw together texts that speak of God's face. At the conclusion of this section, Tertullian quotes a christological reading of Lam 4:20 (*"The spirit of his countenance, Christ the Lord"*) and comments, "Therefore if Christ is the spirit of the Father's countenance (*personae*), rightly has the Spirit pronounced him of whose countenance he [himself] was, that is, of his Father, to be his own face, undoubtedly on account of their unity."<sup>80</sup> Leaving aside the somewhat unusual argument that the Father is the Son's face, we can instead find yet another example of the Spirit speaking through the Old Testament to call Christ "Lord" and to describe the nature of his relationship with the Father. That the Spirit is likely meant to be understood as a primary speaking agent despite this quotation not involving speech to another divine person is the result of the fact that this passage follows so closely on the heels of texts which clearly portray the Spirit in this light in *Prax.* 11.7–8 and that it again portrays the Spirit as interacting with both of the other divine persons. That the Spirit ascribes lordship to only the Son, and not also the Father, indicates that this is yet another instance of intra-divine and not Trinitarian testimony.

In sum, we have found that Tertullian, over the course of his life and as he increasingly identified with the New Prophecy, gradually came to embrace the concepts of the Spirit having the capacity to be a primary speaking agent in its own right and to provide intra-divine and even Trinitarian testimony. Crucially, however, we have found that when Tertullian portrays the Spirit as participating in intra-divine dialogue, the testifying function of the Spirit is only implicit in the quotations themselves and not in Tertullian's own introduction to or explanation of those quotations, as Tertullian's use of prosopological exegesis is motivated by an overarching desire to distinguish the divine persons rather than to establish the deity or lordship of the Father or the Son. Instead, as we will find in the following section, Tertullian's understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit is most clearly stated apart from his portrayal of the Spirit's prosopological speech.

80 *Prax.* 14.10 (FC 34:168): *Spiritus personae eius Christus Dominus. Ergo si Christus personae paternae spiritus est, merito spiritus cuius personae erat, id est Patris, eum faciem suam, ex unitate scilicet, pronuntiavit.* On the difficulties of rendering the Latin text of this passage into English, see Evans, *Praxeas*, 278–279.

## Historical-Theological Context: The Testimony of the Spirit in the Redefined Divine Economy

As argued above, Tertullian's writings suggest only a loose relationship between the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit and the Spirit's prosopological speech. On the other hand, the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony features heavily in Tertullian's thought, apart from prosopological exegesis, as a part of his broader theological construct. Given that there is no doubt that Tertullian is explicitly focused throughout *Prax.* on refuting the claims of modalistic monarchianism, it will be necessary to refer to this historical context to describe Tertullian's motivation for developing this particular argument. Specifically, then, this section will assess how Tertullian's understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit fit into his broader understanding of the divine economy in light of his defense of the New Prophecy. Proceeding with this task will require being particularly attentive to the current debates about Tertullian's pneumatology that were noted in the introduction to this chapter; thus, the aim of this section is to provide a fresh perspective on the questions of the extent to which Tertullian's embrace of the New Prophecy changed his understanding of the Spirit and the extent to which Tertullian endowed the Spirit with a unique measure of personhood.

### *Tertullian and the Divine Economy*

As seen in the previous chapter of this book, Irenaeus used the term "economy" (οἰκονομία; *dispensatio*) to describe the manner or sequence in which God reveals himself through the narrative of creation and redemption. As this section will demonstrate, Tertullian built upon Irenaeus's understanding to develop his own view of the divine economy.<sup>81</sup> A first point of comparison can be found in how both Irenaeus and Tertullian link their descriptions of the divine economy with the *regula fidei*, which summarizes the basic content of the narrative of Scripture.<sup>82</sup> For instance, at the outset of his treatise against

81 That Tertullian's understanding of the divine economy was influenced by that of Irenaeus, see, e.g., Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 110; Rankin, "Tertullian's Vocabulary," 20.

82 Tertullian also states the *regula fidei* at *Praescr.* 13.1–6 (CCSL 1:197–198) and *Virg.* 1.3 (CCSL 2:1209); Evans (*Praxeas*, 190–192) compares these three forms in detail. On Tertullian's understanding of the *regula fidei*, see further Everett Ferguson, *The Rule of Faith: A Guide*, Cascade Companions 20 (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015), 6–8, 21–24, 40–41; Paul M. Blowers, "The *Regula Fidei* and the Narrative Character of Early Christian Faith," *ProEccl* 6 (1997): 199–228. Litfin ("Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*," 176–182) observes that *Marc.* as a whole follows the general sequence of the *regula fidei*.



the modalistic monarchians (*Prax.* 2.1–2), Tertullian makes the following claim concerning the divine economy and the *regula fidei*:

In truth, as always—and now even more so, being better instructed by the Paraclete, the leader into all truth—we believe that there is indeed one only God, yet under this dispensation (or “economy”), that this one only God has also a Son, his Word, who proceeded from himself, by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing has been made, [...] who then, in accordance with his promise, sent from the Father the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, the sanctifier of the faith of those who believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. That this rule has come down from the beginning of the Gospel [...] he will prove [...].<sup>83</sup>

This passage demonstrates that, for Tertullian, an essential part of this divine self-revelation, as summarized in his presentation of the tripartite *regula fidei*, is the distinction of Father, Son, and Spirit. This distinction was of course already present in Irenaeus’s presentation of the divine economy,<sup>84</sup> but Tertullian, in the context of heated conflict with the adherents of modalistic monarchianism, drives home this distinction in much more detail.<sup>85</sup> For instance, whereas Irenaeus did not give analogies to describe how unity can coexist alongside of distinction within the Godhead, Tertullian gives several that, in contrast to earlier and contemporaneous such metaphors, are inclusive of not

83 *Prax.* 2.1–2 (FC 34:102–104): Nos vero et semper et nunc magis, ut instructiores per Paracletum, deductorem scilicet omnis veritatis, unicum quidem Deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispensatione quam oikonomiam dicimus, ut unici Dei sit et Filius, sermo ipsius qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt et sine quo factum est nihil. [...] Qui exinde miserit secundum promissionem suam a Patre Spiritum sanctum, Paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum. Hanc regulam ab initio evangelii decurrisse [...] probabit [...]. My translation, which takes the Paraclete as the subject of *probabit*, is based on the prior context as well as the fact that this is an active verb; generally speaking, a normal transitive verb would need a passive ending to be used impersonally (as most published translations prefer).

84 See again *Haer.* 1.10.1, 3.4.2, 4.33.7 (SC 264:154–158; SC 211:46–48; SC 100:816–818); *Epid.* 6 (SC 406:90–92).

85 See further Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 111–115; Rankin, “Tertullian’s Vocabulary,” 21; McGowan, “Origins of the ‘Orthodox’ Trinity,” 443: “Tertullian’s main goal throughout [*Prax.*] is to allay fears that the real existence of a second divine person would undermine the principle of a single divine power or *monarchia*.”

just the Father and the Son or the Father and the Spirit but of all three divine persons.<sup>86</sup> In one of his most famous passages, Tertullian proffers the following analogy:

For God brought forth the Word, as also the Paraclete teaches, as the root [brings forth] the tree, and the spring the river, and the sun the beam. For these also are manifestations (or “projections”) of those substances from which they proceed. [...] But where there is a second there are two, and where there is a third there are three. For the Spirit is third from God and the Son, as the fruit from the tree is third (*tertius*) from the root, the stream from the river is third from the spring, and the apex of the beam is third from the sun. Nothing, however, is alienated from the source from which it derives its own properties. In this way the Trinity, flowing down from the Father by intertwined and connected degrees, does not impede the monarchy while it protects the condition of the economy.<sup>87</sup>

Tertullian, as his conclusion to this passage underscores, takes pains to argue that his insistence on distinguishing the divine persons is not, as the modalistic monarchians would claim, tritheism, but rather a way of preserving diversity (i.e., the economy) alongside of an essential unity of the Godhead (i.e., the

86 For other examples of early Christian metaphors that seek to explain the relationship between the Father and the Son, see, e.g., Justin, *Dial.* 61.2, 128.3 (PTS 47:175, 292–293); Tatian, *Or. Graec.* 5.4 (PTS 43:14); Hippolytus, *Noet.* 11 (PG 10:817C). Athenagoras at *Leg.* 10.4 and 24.1 (PTS 31:41, 78) uses sun and fire imagery to describe the relationship between the Father and the Spirit; see further Abraham J. Malherbe, “The Holy Spirit in Athenagoras,” *JTS* 20 (1969): 538–542. Tertullian gives other Trinitarian metaphors at *Apol.* 21.12–14 (CCSL 1:124–125) and *Prax.* 14.3 (FC 34:164). For analysis of these examples, and their possible roots in Philonic exegesis, see further McGowan, “Tertullian and the Trinity,” 72–74. The literary relationship between the roughly contemporaneous *Prax.* and *Noet.* is complex, but for overview of the issue see Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop*, VCSup 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 529–535.

87 *Prax.* 8.5, 7 (FC 34:132–134): Protulit enim Deus sermonem, quemadmodum etiam Paracletus docet, sicut radix fruticem et fons fluvium et sol radium. Nam et istae species probolae sunt earum substantiarum ex quibus prodeunt. [...] Secundus autem ubi est, duo sunt et tertius ubi est, tres sunt. Tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo et Filio sicut tertius a radice fructus ex frutice et tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine et tertius a sole apex ex radio. Nihil tamen a matrice alienatur a qua proprietates suas ducit. Ita trinitas per consertos et connexos gradus a Patre decurrens et monarchiae nihil obstrept et oikonomiae statum protegit.

monarchy). In fact, it is precisely the economy that preserves the monarchy, for the Son and the Spirit are ultimately united to the Father for the purpose of carrying out the Father's will.<sup>88</sup> To put it another way, Tertullian has redefined the notion of the monarchy, contra the modalistic monarchians' understanding of the term, through the lens of his conception of the divine economy. In so doing, however, Tertullian appears to have also redefined the idea of the economy itself, insofar as his understanding of the Triune nature of God appears to go beyond how God has revealed himself in the narrative of creation and redemption to also include the realm of God's own inner life, as the metaphors and their language of origin or procession seem to suggest.<sup>89</sup> Here Tertullian draws on the Stoic distinction between substance and relative disposition to argue for the existence of unchanging relationships within the Godhead that predated creation.<sup>90</sup>

That Tertullian describes the Spirit as "third" (*tertius*) in sequence is, we recall, a key element of Barnes's argument that, having rejected older Jewish-Christian forms of pneumatology, Tertullian then developed a new "conceptual superstructure" focused upon the "order" (*taxis* or *gradus*) of the three divine persons.<sup>91</sup> Despite this hierarchical view of the Godhead that would result in Tertullian later being castigated as a subordinationist, it is nevertheless the case that he presents the Spirit as a fully divine person; the Spirit,

88 McCruden ("Monarchy and Economy," 329) notes that Tertullian seems to share with Irenaeus "a comparable understanding of the Son and Spirit as effectively the two hands of God," though he concedes that "Tertullian's notion of agency is of a more or less generalized character," whereas Irenaeus mostly limited this idea to the sphere of creation. See further *Prax.* 3.2–5 (FC 34:108–112) for Tertullian's statement on how the Son and the Spirit carry out the will of the Father. On the necessity of the economy for Tertullian, see further Osborn, *Tertullian*, 121–125.

89 McCruden, "Monarchy and Economy," 329–332; McGowan, "Origins of the 'Orthodox' Trinity," 443. McCruden ("Monarchy and Economy," 336) suggests that Tertullian shifted his understanding of the divine economy "out of a primarily historical realm" because that approach was particularly vulnerable to a modalistic monarchian reading. Osborn (*Tertullian*, 123) rightly cautions that "many interpreters have gone wrong because they have forgotten that the intellectual metaphors come first and are not supplanted by the visual metaphors." See also Stegman, "Tertullian's Doctrine," 218–220.

90 See further Osborn, *Tertullian*, 125–130. McGowan ("Tertullian and the Trinity," 65–68) explores further the development over time of Tertullian's understanding of when the divine substance took on a Trinitarian disposition.

91 Barnes, "Beginning and End," 184–186. Cf. *Prax.* 2.4, 30.5 (FC 34:106, 252); Hippolytus, *Noet.* 14 (PG 10:821A).

like the Son, is downstream in the current of divinity springing forth from the Father, the fount of divine fullness.<sup>92</sup> Indeed, the Spirit is of one *substantia* with the Father and the Son,<sup>93</sup> and as a result the Spirit shares the same aspects or attributes as the other divine persons.<sup>94</sup> The Spirit, like the Father and the Son, is characterized as a fully realized *persona*, which in *Prax.* has, as argued above, moved out of the literary sphere and taken on the sense of a “distinct individual existence.”<sup>95</sup>

Having briefly introduced Tertullian’s conception of the divine economy, we can now examine Tertullian’s statements on the Spirit’s role within this economy, particularly insofar as they involve the Spirit providing testimony to the other divine persons.

### *Tertullian and the Testimony of the Spirit in the Divine Economy*

As argued in the previous chapter of this book, Irenaeus portrays the Spirit as the divine person responsible for revealing the divine economy to human beings, a function of the Spirit that is linked with its action of testifying to the deity or lordship of the Father and the Son. The first glimpse of a similar theme in Tertullian is found in his aforementioned overview of the divine economy and the *regula fidei* (*Prax.* 2.1–2), in which he makes the following comment concerning the role of the Spirit:

In truth, as always—and now even more so, being better instructed by the Paraclete, the leader into all truth—we believe that there is indeed one only God, yet under this dispensation (or “economy”), that this one only God has also a Son, his Word, who proceeded from himself, by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing has been made, [...] who then, in accordance with his promise, sent from the Father the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, the sanctifier of the faith of those who believe in the Father

92 McCruden, “Monarchy and Economy,” 333; McCruden further points out that the emphasis on origin in this passage is further evidence of Tertullian’s redefinition of the divine economy to focus upon God’s internal nature.

93 This term *substantia* is difficult to interpret. Osborn (*Tertullian*, 131–132) argues that *substantia* should be understood in the Stoic sense as “the constitutive material of a thing,” though he concedes that the modern understanding of “material” does not easily map onto the ancient sense; Tertullian seems to characterize the divine substance as *spiritus*, as at *Prax.* 26.4 (FC 34:228). See further Evans, *Praxeas*, 39–45.

94 Osborn, *Tertullian*, 130–131.

95 Osborn, *Tertullian*, 133; cf. Stegman, “Tertullian’s Doctrine,” 221–231.

and the Son and the Holy Spirit. That this rule has come down from the beginning of the Gospel [...] he will prove [...].<sup>96</sup>

According to this passage, Tertullian argues that the Spirit provides believers with two important and interrelated things: knowledge of all truth and knowledge of the divine economy. Irenaeus, for his part, made the same two points concerning the work of the Spirit,<sup>97</sup> and Tertullian has adapted Irenaeus's argument with only slight modifications. For one thing, whereas Irenaeus simply referred to this divine being as the "Spirit of God," Tertullian uses the more explicitly Johannine (and "Montanist") term "Paraclete." Likewise, while Irenaeus referred to the Spirit as the one who "gives the knowledge of the truth" (*praestat agnitionem veritatis*), Tertullian describes the Spirit as the one who is the "leader into all truth" (*deductorem scilicet omnis veritatis*), a more clear quotation of John 16:13.<sup>98</sup> This "truth," as in Irenaeus, is then unpacked as the knowledge of the divine economy, here with emphasis on the distinctiveness of each of the divine persons, as was the case with Tertullian's use of prosopological exegesis in *Prax.* 11.<sup>99</sup> Again insofar as the revelation of the divine economy involves the Spirit identifying both the Father and the Son as true God and true Lord, we can speak of this as an aspect of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit.

The influence of the New Prophecy on this passage and Tertullian's presentation of the *regula fidei* may be demonstrated in three ways, as observed by McGowan. First, as noted above, the Paraclete of the New Prophecy is described as the means by which one can better grasp the truths presented in the *regula fidei* concerning the divine economy. Second, as the conclusion of this passage indicates, specific beliefs concerning this Paraclete have been included as a part of the *regula fidei* itself. Third, and perhaps most significantly, Tertullian links the Paraclete's teaching on discipline (i.e., the Paraclete's sanctification) with its teaching on doctrine.<sup>100</sup> After all, it is the Paraclete, Tertullian argues, who proves that the *regula fidei* is the correct summary of the apostles' original teaching. The Paraclete is thus at the center of both right belief and right action.

96 *Prax.* 2.1–2 (FC 34:102–104).

97 *Haer.* 4.33.7 (SC 100:818).

98 See also *Cor.* 4.6 (CCSL 2:1045); *Praescr.* 22.9, 28.1 (CCSL 1:204, 209).

99 Rankin ("Tertullian's Vocabulary," 5 n. 1) comments that for Tertullian "the Paraclete is also [besides discipline] the teacher of doctrine, particularly with respect to the economy (oikonomia) of the Trinity." McGowan ("Origins of the 'Orthodox' Trinity," 452) describes the Paraclete's role as "teaching the truth of the Father's and the Son's persons and being."

100 McGowan, "Origins of the 'Orthodox' Trinity," 451–453.

The teaching ministry of the Paraclete is further underscored in another passage examined earlier (*Prax.* 8.5), in which Tertullian begins with the following claim:

For God brought forth the Word, as also the Paraclete teaches, as the root [brings forth] the tree, and the spring the river, and the sun the beam. For these also are manifestations (or “projections”) of those substances from which they proceed.<sup>101</sup>

Here Tertullian describes the Paraclete as teaching about the relationship between the Father and the Son in line with what he described in *Prax.* 2.1–2. McGowan notes that this reference to the Paraclete’s teaching, when compared with other instances in which Tertullian describes this action of the Paraclete, “suggests he is actually attributing this three-fold image to an utterance of one of the New Prophets.”<sup>102</sup> Whether or not this is actually the case, we here have another example of the Paraclete teaching doctrine concerning the other divine persons.

Lest there be any doubt about Tertullian’s understanding of the Spirit and its function in revealing the divine economy, or about the New Prophecy’s influence on Tertullian concerning his articulation of this matter, the conclusion of this treatise (*Prax.* 30.5) provides perhaps the single most important statement concerning the Spirit and Trinitarian testimony in all of the ante-Nicene writings:

[The Son], meanwhile, has poured out the gift he has received from the Father, the Holy Spirit, the third name (*nomen*) of the divinity and the third degree (*gradum*) of the majesty, the preacher of the one monarchy but also the interpreter of the economy, and, if anyone admits the words of his new prophecy, also the leader into all truth which is in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit according to the Christian mystery.<sup>103</sup>

<sup>101</sup> *Prax.* 8.5 (FC 34:132).

<sup>102</sup> McGowan, “Origins of the ‘Orthodox’ Trinity,” 445; cf. *Pud.* 21.7 (SC 394:270); *Res.* 11.2 (CCSL 2:933); *Exh. cast.* 10.5 (SC 319:106). McGowan goes on to point out that though some elements had previously been used elsewhere, “the two further images of plant and water, and the extension of all three metaphors to a third stage, are new elements in *Against Praxeas*.”

<sup>103</sup> *Prax.* 30.5 (FC 34:252): Hic interim acceptum a Patre munus effudit, Spiritum sanctum, tertium nomen divinitatis et tertium gradum maiestatis, unius praedicatorem monarchiae sed et oikonomiae interpretatorem, si quis sermones novae prophetiae eius admisit et

In Tertullian's understanding, as revealed by this text, the Spirit's primary purpose is to guide Christians into an understanding of the Trinity.<sup>104</sup> The Spirit, Tertullian again emphasizes, has the clear purpose of setting doctrine concerning the nature of God.<sup>105</sup> Tertullian thereby gives the Spirit two new titles by which to explain its function in this regard. First, the Spirit is "the preacher of one monarchy" (*unius praedicatorem monarchiae*). This, of course, refers to the fundamental truth that God is one. Second, the Spirit is "the interpreter of the economy" (*oeconomiae interpretatorem*). This, on the other hand, demonstrates that the monarchy can only be understood through an awareness of the plurality of divine persons. In both cases, it is the Spirit who reveals these truths. While Tertullian understands there to be a hierarchy within the Godhead, with the Spirit as third in degree or grade,<sup>106</sup> he could not be more clear in identifying the Spirit as a distinct person of the Trinity with a unique ministry in testifying to the distinct identities of the other divine persons.<sup>107</sup> Thus, as David Rankin concludes, within the overall argument of *Prax.* it is nothing less than "the testimony of the Holy Spirit which establishes these distinctions and thus its own identity and authority."<sup>108</sup> If, therefore, the orthodox understanding of the divine economy is belief in both the unity and diversity of God, it is the Spirit who reveals this truth.<sup>109</sup> The influence of the New Prophecy is particularly prevalent in this passage. Here the Spirit is presented as revealing the truth about the divine economy only "for those who admit the words of his new prophecy." This claim, echoing that observed above in *Prax.* 2.1–2, gets at the question of what specific historical pressures caused Tertullian to develop this particular view of the Spirit and its Trinitarian testimony, which will be explored in more detail below.

---

deductorem omnis veritatis quae est in Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto secundum Christianum sacramentum.

104 Cp. Origen, *Princ.* 2.7.4 (SC 252:332–334).

105 Evans, *One and Holy*, 30: "[Tertullian] clearly asserts that a right understanding of the relations among the 'persons' of the godhead is due to the operation of the Spirit," such that "the Spirit works not simply at the level of 'discipline' but at the level of 'doctrine' as well, bringing to pass the correct understanding of the relations among Father, Son, and Spirit, those three prominent headings of belief in the rule of faith."

106 On this technical term *gradus*, see further Rankin, "Tertullian's Vocabulary," 18–20. In this passage, *nomen* seems to be functioning synonymously with *persona*; cf. *ibid.*, 24–28.

107 McCruden ("Monarchy and Economy," 332) points out that even when Tertullian speaks of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit as sharing one *substantia*, this unity of substance "does not imply an identical substance."

108 Rankin, "Tertullian's Vocabulary," 8.

109 Rankin, "Tertullian's Vocabulary," 22.

To summarize, Tertullian's most clear statements concerning the Spirit's role in providing testimony to the Father and the Son are found not in the context of prosopological exegesis but rather in his descriptions of the Spirit's role within the divine economy. With respect to the first of the two debates concerning the Spirit set out at the beginning of this chapter, this analysis has shown that the New Prophecy exhibited a profound influence on Tertullian's conception of the Trinity. It is only after Tertullian fully embraces the New Prophecy that the Spirit is clearly portrayed as a fully divine person with the purpose of providing Trinitarian testimony, not just with respect to prosopological exegesis but also with respect to his broader theological understanding of the divine economy. This demonstrates that even with all of the continuities observable in Tertullian's pneumatology over the course of his literary career, there is nevertheless a major discontinuity with respect to this innovation concerning the Spirit's role in the divine economy. The reasons for this shift will be explored in more detail below, as we turn to the related question of why Tertullian felt the need to articulate the distinct divine personhood of the Holy Spirit through its testifying function.

### *Tertullian and the Personhood of the Spirit in the Divine Economy*

Having observed that Tertullian's clearest statements concerning the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit were in the context of his broader theological project of redefining the divine economy in order to combat the claims of modalistic monarchianism, we will now pull together many of the threads developed earlier in this chapter in order to examine why Tertullian insisted upon the Spirit as the third divine person of the Trinity.

Given that the bulk of *Prax.* is focused on distinguishing the Father from the Son in order to avoid the problem of patripassianism,<sup>110</sup> the need for the Spirit as a third divine person is at least on the surface unclear. Kevin McCrudden, for instance, suggests that the need to preserve the invisibility and transcendence of the Father was a foundational motivation for Tertullian's drive to distinguish the first two divine persons,<sup>111</sup> but makes little attempt to explain what would have motivated the need for a third. McGowan, however, examines Tertullian's account of the *regula fidei*, noting the aforementioned role of the Paraclete in leading believers into true knowledge of the divine economy, and concludes that the Paraclete's primary function was "teaching the truth of the Father's

110 McCrudden, "Monarchy and Economy," 334; McCrudden points to *Prax.* 2.1 (FC 34:102) as evidence of this as the central concern of this work.

111 McCrudden, "Monarchy and Economy," 335.



and the Son's persons and being."<sup>112</sup> This is, albeit less precisely, what this study has termed the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, and it is the need for this testimony, I suggest, that gives rise to Tertullian's need for a third divine person.

Indeed, Tertullian points to an explanation for why the Spirit functions in *Prax.* to testify to the Father and the Son as distinct divine beings. As discussed in the first chapter of this book, one important principle of Platonic philosophy is that of like knowing like. Just as, therefore, the Son alone knows the Father because of their shared *substantia*, so also the Spirit can only genuinely testify to the Father and the Son if it too shares their *substantia*.<sup>113</sup> In other words, the truth of the Spirit's testimony is guaranteed by its status within the current of divinity springing forth from the Father.<sup>114</sup> Just as important for the capacity of providing this testimony is the Spirit's status as a fully distinct being. As Rankin observes, the Spirit and its ministry in testifying to the other divine persons "would amount to nothing if his existence as a distinct being could not be guaranteed."<sup>115</sup> In other words, in order to demonstrate the distinction between the Father and the Son (again, the larger point of *Prax.*), Tertullian needed to establish an understanding of a third divine person who possesses the authority to make this distinction clear.<sup>116</sup> Accordingly, Tertullian expands his analogies describing the relationship between the Father and the Son to now encompass a third divine person, the Holy Spirit, who is the means by which human beings experience and participate in God.<sup>117</sup> It is true that the Spirit does not receive the same level of attention and definition as do the Father and the Son, but Tertullian's description of the Spirit as a fully distinct divine person existing before the creation of the world is nevertheless a remarkable landmark in the history of the development of pre-Nicene pneumatology. That Tertullian identifies one of the major tasks of this third divine person to be revealing the mystery of the divine economy is evidence that Tertullian fol-

---

112 McGowan, "Origins of the 'Orthodox' Trinity," 452; cf. *Prax.* 2.1 (FC 34:104). As Tertullian's presentation of the *regula fidei* indicates, belief in the Paraclete is both the means by which the *regula fidei* is communicated as well as a key component of its content.

113 See again *Prax.* 8.4–7 (FC 34:130–134); Tertullian here actually quotes 1 Cor 2:11, the key Pauline text on "like knowing like," though he takes the "Spirit of God" to refer to the Son and not the third person of the Trinity. See also *Prax.* 19.2 (FC 34:188–190); Origen, *Princ.* 1.3.4 (SC 252:150).

114 See again *Prax.* 8.7 (FC 34:134).

115 Rankin, "Tertullian's Vocabulary," 44.

116 Rankin, "Tertullian's Vocabulary," 45.

117 See further McGowan, "Tertullian and the Trinity," 72–78.

lows Justin and especially Irenaeus in developing the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, even though he does so largely apart from prosopological exegesis.

To bring this section to a close, we may briefly return to Tertullian's specific historical context, arguing that Tertullian's motivation for making this move was very likely related to his desire to defend the New Prophecy and thereby bolster his own religious authority. Recent scholarship has demonstrated the likelihood that Tertullian never formally left the catholic church in Carthage; instead, he was probably at most a member of a faction within the church that criticized the less ascetically rigorous members of the community (the *psychici*, to use Tertullian's term).<sup>118</sup> While it has often been assumed that these *psychici* differed from Tertullian's group only with respect to the extent of their commitment to ascetic discipline, McGowan has recently shown that the *psychici* are in fact to be identified with those Tertullian criticizes in *Prax.* as simpletons (*simplices*).<sup>119</sup> The key text supporting this view is found in *Prax.* 3.1:

For all of the simple people (*simplices*)—[I call them this] so that I have not said [that they are] unaware and ignorant, who are always the majority of the believers, since the Rule of Faith itself transfers [them] from the many gods of the world to the one only true God—not understanding that while they must believe in one only [God] yet with his economy, they are afraid [...]. In this way they say that two or even three [gods] are preached by us, but they proclaim that they are themselves worshippers of one God.<sup>120</sup>

118 Indeed, there could have been considerable diversity in the beliefs and practices of the Carthaginian Christians without there having been a formal rupture of communion. See further the thorough defense of this position in Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church*, 27–40; cf. Dunn, *Tertullian*, 6–7; Trevett, *Montanism*, 68–69; Zilling, *Tertullian*, 51–53; Powell, “Tertullianists and Cataphrygians,” 33–38. A more extreme position goes so far as to say that Tertullian was not even a member of a sub-group within the church at Carthage; cf. Wilhite, “Spirit of Prophecy,” 48.

119 McGowan, “Origins of the ‘Orthodox’ Trinity,” 449–451. McGowan puts forward *Prax.* 3 as evidence of Tertullian describing the *simplices* as believing in what modern scholars call modalistic monarchianism.

120 *Prax.* 3.1 (FC 34:108): *Simplices enim quique, ne dixerim imprudentes et idiotae, quae maior semper credentium pars est, quoniam et ipsa regula fidei a pluribus diis saeculi ad unicum et verum Deum transfert, non intellegentes unicum quidem sed cum sua oikonomia esse credendum, expavescunt [...]. Ita duos et tres iam iactitant a nobis praedicari, se vero unius Dei cultores praesumunt.*

Tertullian here indicates that he considers most of the Christians in his city to be former polytheists who, under the guidance of the *regula fidei*, have been enlightened as to the truth that there is one God; however, because of their inability to grasp the complexity of Tertullian's Trinitarian theology, they have labeled him a polytheist.<sup>121</sup> As such, Tertullian and his faction are a minority both on account of their insistence on asceticism as well as their rejection of modalistic monarchianism. This link between these two points of opposition to Tertullian can in fact be found in his description of Praxeas at the outset of *Prax.* when he writes, "Thus Praxeas at Rome attended to two items of the devil's business: he drove out prophecy and introduced heresy; he put to flight the Paraclete and crucified the Father."<sup>122</sup> Like Praxeas, then, the majority of Carthaginian Christians opposed key elements of Tertullian's proposed doctrine and practice. Thus, we can readily imagine a scenario in which Tertullian, as he increasingly adopted the views of the New Prophecy over the course of the first decade of the third century, found himself on the theological defensive on two fronts. Tertullian's *Prax.* must thus be set in the context of his fear that what Praxeas had done to the New Prophecy in Rome was all too similar to what was happening to the New Prophecy in Carthage.<sup>123</sup>

With this context in mind, it is evident why Tertullian has taken such pains to link the Spirit's role in teaching right doctrine with its role in leading believers into right practice. As McGowan summarizes, "Tertullian's distinctive pneumatology then consists not only or not so much in whatever distinct emphasis he gives to the third divine person of the economy, but in the organic link between what is confessed about the Spirit in the Rule of Faith and what is done by and with the Spirit in the Church."<sup>124</sup> Tertullian's argument thus proceeds from his demonstration, primarily from the evidence of Scripture, of the distinction among the divine persons, to the claim that this truth is safeguarded by the same Spirit of whom the *regula fidei* speaks and who continues to play an active life in leading the people of God into all truth. In other words, it appears

121 McGowan, "Origins of the 'Orthodox' Trinity," 450: "The followers of Praxeas falsehood are not a marginal group disturbing the doctrinal peace of the church; rather Tertullian implies that a majority of the Carthaginian Christians, notionally adhering to the Rule of Faith but somehow distant from its trinitarian element, are openly or latently monarchian."

122 *Prax.* 1.5 (FC 34:100): Ita duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romae procuravit: prophetiam expulit et haeresin intulit, Paracletum fugavit et Patrem crucifixit.

123 McCrudden ("Monarchy and Economy," 327) also describes Tertullian as being "on the defensive" in this treatise.

124 McGowan, "Tertullian and the Trinity," 80.

that Tertullian intended to move his audience from accepting a more easily palatable notion (that the Scriptures distinguish among the divine persons) to a more difficult one (that the Paraclete has authority in doctrine and practice). Given the decline of the New Prophecy but the rise of a Trinitarian theology along the lines of what Tertullian has set forth in *Prax.*, it appears that his readers were nevertheless able to accept the former principle without the latter. Thus, though his defense of the New Prophecy may have been unsuccessful in the long term, his desire to promote a “Montanist” view of the Spirit helped clarify the Trinitarian identity of the Spirit as one of the three divine persons. Whereas these ideas may have been implicit in Tertullian’s use of prosopological exegesis, they are in fact most explicitly articulated apart from his use of that ancient reading technique, a shift which brings us to consider Tertullian’s legacy in this regard.

### **After Tertullian: The Decline of Pneumatology in the Latin Tradition**

In this final section, we will consider the extent to which Tertullian’s successors in the Latin tradition, who are generally considered to have had little interest in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and an overall “lower” pneumatology,<sup>125</sup> continued to emphasize the Spirit’s function of providing Trinitarian testimony. In particular, we will focus on Cyprian and Novatian, who both wrote in the middle of the third century and who occupied opposing theological ground on the issue of whether to readmit lapsed believers in the wake of the Decian persecution. Of all the Latin writers between Tertullian and the Council of Nicaea whose writings are extant, Cyprian provides the most examples of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Spirit, while Novatian makes the clearest statements of the Spirit’s function in testifying to the other divine persons. Other Latin writers who seem to have made use of Tertullian’s *Prax.* will also be briefly referenced with respect to the degree to which they engage with the issue of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. Exploring this pneumatological trajectory into this next generation of Latin writers will not only allow us to better gauge how Tertullian’s claims on the subject were received in subsequent

---

<sup>125</sup> See especially Manlio Simonetti, “Il regresso della teologia dello Spirito santo in Occidente dopo Tertulliano,” *Aug 20* (1980): 655–669. This also appears to be the understanding undergirding the second phase of the Ayres-Barnes schema, which suggests that the rejection of Jewish-Christian ideas by Origen and Tertullian brought to an end the first period of “high” pneumatology; see again Barnes, “Beginning and End,” 180.

decades but also to see how the trend observed in Tertullian (a diminishing emphasis on prosopological exegesis and an increasing emphasis on the divine economy) fits in the broader pneumatological trajectory of the time.

### *Cyprian of Carthage*

The first Latin writer we will consider is Cyprian of Carthage.<sup>126</sup> Given that Cyprian was, like Tertullian, a Carthaginian, it is unlikely that Cyprian did not have access to Tertullian's voluminous writings.<sup>127</sup> That being said, scholars have struggled to discern the precise nature of Tertullian's influence on Cyprian, and as such claims of dependence must be validated on an individual basis.<sup>128</sup> Though most of Cyprian's pneumatology is focused upon the Spirit's role in conversion and baptism,<sup>129</sup> his frequent presentation of the Spirit as the speaker of quotations from the Old Testament warrants comparison with the pattern observed in Tertullian.

Cyprian's use of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Spirit has in fact been explored in a recent article by David J. Downs, who suggests influence on this matter from Tertullian.<sup>130</sup> Downs argues that Cyprian, in his treatise *On Works and Alms* (*De opere et eleemosynis*), identifies the Holy Spirit as the speaker of certain Old Testament quotations in order to give added weight to his claim that almsgiving can cleanse post-baptismal sin. Downs notes Tertullian's use of prosopological exegesis in *Prax.* 11 and, though he

126 While a full introduction to Cyprian's life and theology is beyond the scope of this book, see further J. Patout Burns, Jr., *Cyprian the Bishop*, Routledge Early Church Monographs (London: Routledge, 2002); Allen Brent, *Cyprian and Roman Carthage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

127 Indeed, Jerome at *Vir. ill.* 53 (PL 23:698) cites a tradition that Cyprian was known to tell his secretary to bring him the works of Tertullian, whom he called "the master."

128 See, e.g., Michael Andrew Fahey, *Cyprian and the Bible: A Study in Third-Century Exegesis*, BGBH 9 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971), 626, who concludes that his study "proves to a surprising extent Cyprian's independence from Tertullian in both his choice and interpretation of Scriptural texts, but further investigation needs to juxtapose citation by citation." Conversely, Maurice Wiles, "The Theological Legacy of St Cyprian," in *Working Papers in Doctrine* (London: SCM, 1976), 66–80, identifies Tertullian as the largest influence on Cyprian besides the Bible (see esp. 69–70).

129 See, e.g., *Ep.* 74.5, 75.8–9 (CCSL 3C:569–570, 589–590); Michael A.G. Haykin, "The Holy Spirit in Cyprian's *To Donatus*," *EvQ* 83 (2011): 321–329.

130 David J. Downs, "Prosopological Exegesis in Cyprian's *De opere et eleemosynis*," *JTI* 6 (2012): 279–294. For an expansion of the argument of this section, see Kyle R. Hughes, "The Spirit and the Scriptures: Revisiting Cyprian's Use of Prosopological Exegesis," *JECH* 8 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1080/2222582X.2018.1429941>.

admits that he cannot be certain that Cyprian borrowed the reading strategy of prosopological exegesis from Tertullian, he nevertheless describes the connection between them as “intriguing.”<sup>131</sup> This potential influence of Tertullian’s *Prax.* 11 on Cyprian must therefore be examined in more detail. At the center of his argument, Downs focuses upon the following passage from *Eleem.* 2:

The Holy Spirit speaks in the Scriptures and says, *By almsgiving and faith sins are purged* [Prov 16:6 (LXX 15:27)]. Not, in any case, those sins which had been contracted before, for those are purged by the blood and sanctification of Christ. Likewise he says again, *As water extinguishes fire, so almsgiving extinguishes sin* [Sir 3:30].<sup>132</sup>

Though Downs makes much of the fact that these Old Testament quotations are interpreted prosopologically according to Bates’s definition of the term, these examples are better understood as instances of what Bates would later describe as the Spirit speaking as an inspiring secondary agent and not as a primary speaking agent in its own right.<sup>133</sup> Downs tries to contrast these examples of the Spirit’s speech with those in which Cyprian presents the Spirit as speaking through a human figure such as Solomon,<sup>134</sup> but, as we have seen throughout this book, there appears to be no correlation between whether a human figure is mentioned alongside the Spirit and whether the Spirit is speaking in a primary or a secondary sense.<sup>135</sup> Rather, we have found that the Spirit is portrayed as speaking from its own person (thus true prosopological exegesis) when either the introductory verbs demand a personal agent (as in the case of a verb such as θεολογέω) or the Spirit is portrayed as participating in the theodrama (as in the case of intra-divine dialogue). The Spirit’s speech

<sup>131</sup> Downs, “Prosopological Exegesis,” 288.

<sup>132</sup> *Eleem.* 2 (CCSL 3A:55): Loquitur in scripturis Spiritus sanctus et dicit: *Eleemosynis et fide delicta purgantur*. Non utique illa delicta quae fuerant ante contracta: nam illa Christi sanguine et sanctificatione purgantur. Item denuo dicit: *Sicut aqua extinguit ignem, sic eleemosyna extinguit peccatum*.

<sup>133</sup> Downs, “Prosopological Exegesis,” 290–291; cf. Bates, *Birth*, 164 n. 18. The same applies to the instance of the Spirit’s speech in *Eleem.* 5 (CCSL 3A:57–58), in which the Spirit speaks the words of Ps 41:1.

<sup>134</sup> Downs, “Prosopological Exegesis,” 291; cf. *Eleem.* 9 (CCSL 3A:60).

<sup>135</sup> To recall just one example, Justin at *Dial.* 56.14 (PTS 47:164) names David and Moses alongside of the Spirit when the Spirit speaks in a primary sense, while in *1 Apol.* 39.1 (SC 507:230) he introduces quotations as just the words of the Spirit when the Spirit speaks in a secondary sense.

in *Eleem.* 2, which has none of these marks of the Spirit speaking in a primary capacity, clearly falls in the category of the Spirit speaking impersonally in a secondary, inspiring role.<sup>136</sup> Downs thus makes too much of a relatively common phenomenon in early Christian writings in which the authority of Scripture is defended on the basis of its divine inspiration.<sup>137</sup> However, had Downs wished to demonstrate that Cyprian, like Tertullian before him, could portray the Spirit as a primary speaking agent in its own right, *Eleem.* 2 is not the strongest place to start. Although the vast majority of Cyprian's references to the Spirit's speech follow the pattern of the Spirit speaking as an inspiring secondary agent,<sup>138</sup> there is at least one text in which the Spirit does appear to speak from its own person more along the lines of what Tertullian presented in *Prax.* 11.7–8.<sup>139</sup>

In his *Letter* 63, Cyprian presents a eucharistic theology, with passages from the Old Testament illuminating the significance of this sacrament. As he works his way through various Old Testament quotations that reference wine, Cyprian

136 See also *Eleem.* 5 (CCSL 3A:57–58). This inspiring function of the Spirit is attested in *Eleem.* 4 (CCSL 3A:57).

137 While Downs's conclusions ("Prosopological Exegesis," 292–293) are still illuminative, it is unclear to me how this appeal to prosopological exegesis adds anything to his argument beyond what an appeal to the divine inspiration of Scripture would have done; Downs does not demonstrate how it might matter that the Spirit speak as its own distinct divine *persona* rather than as a mere inspiring force.

138 See, e.g., *Pat.* 22 (CCSL 3A:131); *Demetr.* 17, 20 (CCSL 3A:45, 46); *Dom. or.* 5 (CCSL 3A:92); *Fort.* 10, 12 (CCSL 3:199, 211); *Hab. virg.* 1, 13 (PL 4:441A, 451A); *Laps.* 10, 27 (CCSL 3:226, 236); *Mort.* 11, 23 (CCSL 3A:22, 29); *Unit. eccl.* 8, 10, 16, 24 (CCSL 3:255, 256–257, 261, 266); *Zel. liv.* 8 (CCSL 3A:79); *Ep.* 3.2, 4.1, 10.2, 59.5, 59.20, 63.5, 67.9, 69.5, 70.2, 73.6 (CCSL 3B: 12, 18, 49; CCSL 3C:346, 372, 395, 460, 476, 509, 536). In *Unit. eccl.* 4 (CCSL 3:252) and *Ep.* 69.2 (CCSL 3C:471–472) the Spirit speaks in the person of Christ.

139 I say "at least one" because there are two other instances that might possibly involve the Spirit speaking as a primary speaking agent, though on the whole I think that not to be the case. In both *Dom. or.* 35 (CCSL 3A:112) and *Ep.* 76.4 (CCSL 3C:612), Cyprian introduces quotations from the Psalter as the words of the Spirit, and the words are spoken either to God, as in the former case, or concerning the Lord, as in the latter. These would seem, therefore, to be ripe as examples of the Spirit providing intra-divine testimony as a primary speaking agent. Both quotations, however, really only make sense as a human being speaking to God, as they focus respectively on prayer and on God's provision of salvation. Given that Cyprian does not have a theology of the incarnation of the Holy Spirit, both these passages are most plausibly read as the Spirit speaking as an inspiring secondary agent, with the human authors still the primary referents for the words that are being spoken, as in the formulations in *Demetr.* 20 (CCSL 3A:46) and *Fort.* 10 (CCSL 3:199).

turns to the book of Isaiah and makes the following statement, portraying the Spirit as testifying to the future ministry of the Son: “And so too in Isaiah the Holy Spirit testifies (*testatur*) to the same concerning the passion of the Lord, saying, *Why are your garments red, and your clothing as from the treading of a full and trodden vat?* [Isa 63:2].”<sup>140</sup> Here Cyprian presents the Spirit as testifying to the Son’s passion. The dialogical nature of the passage, which can plausibly be interpreted in a theodramatic setting, when combined with a verb (*testatur*) implying some degree of personal agency, makes this a likely instance of the Spirit participating in intra-divine dialogue as its own person. Still, the lack of emphasis on ascribing deity or lordship suggests that this is not an example of intra-divine testimony. Likewise, later in the same letter, Cyprian criticizes those who use water instead of wine in the Eucharist, making the following argument: “And the Holy Spirit in the Psalms is not silent about the mystery of this matter, making mention of the Lord’s cup and saying, *Your intoxicating cup is exceedingly excellent* [Ps 23:5 (LXX 22:5)].”<sup>141</sup> Again, the Spirit appears to be speaking theodramatically to the Son as its own person, but intra-divine testimony is still not in view.<sup>142</sup>

Thus, we may conclude that while Cyprian does on rare occasion present the Spirit as a primary speaking agent participating in intra-divine dialogue, he does not make use of the notion of the Spirit’s Trinitarian testimony. As for the question of Tertullian’s influence on Cyprian in this respect, there is little in the way of evidence to support the notion that Cyprian drew on any of the extant writings of Tertullian, much less *Prax.* 11.7–8 in particular. Both the polemical context and the actual quotations themselves are very different between *Prax.* 11.7–8 and *Ep.* 63; as such, it appears that Cyprian does not follow Tertullian in developing the notion of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. This indeed lines up with the conclusion of other scholars that Cyprian, at least relative to Tertullian, had less interest in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.<sup>143</sup> The reason

140 *Ep.* 63.7 (CCSL 3C:396): Nec non et apud Esaïam hoc idem spiritus sanctus de domini passione testatur dicens: *quare rubicunda sunt uestimenta tua, et indumenta tua uelut a calcatione torcularis pleni et percalcati?*

141 *Ep.* 63.11 (CCSL 3C:403): Cuius rei sacramentum nec in psalmis tacet spiritus sanctus faciens mentionem dominici calicis et dicens: *calix tuus inebrians perquam optimus.*

142 Prosopological exegesis from the Spirit seems to play a greater role in *Ep.* 63 than in any of Cyprian’s other extant writings; in addition to the examples above, Cyprian presents the Spirit as speaking in the person of the Father to the Son at *Ep.* 63.4 (CCSL 3C:392–393).

143 Cf. Simonetti, “Il regresso,” 659–661. Haykin (“Holy Spirit,” 327–328) tries to rebut this position with an appeal to Cyprian’s frequent references to the Spirit, but these references are simply not as theological or philosophical as those we have found in Tertullian.



for this pneumatological decline is unclear, however, as it could be argued that Cyprian was simply more interested in praxis than in doctrine; it will therefore take an examination of his opponent Novatian, whose writings are more clearly dependent on Tertullian and indicate a much greater interest in how the Holy Spirit relates to the other members of the Godhead, to shed greater light on the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and its Trinitarian testimony in the Latin tradition after Tertullian.

### *Novatian of Rome*

The second Latin writer we will consider is the Roman presbyter and schismatic Novatian.<sup>144</sup> Like Tertullian, Novatian was a moral rigorist, a fact which would lead him into schism and conflict with Cyprian;<sup>145</sup> also like Tertullian, Novatian wrote a treatise against modalistic monarchianism that made extensive appeal to the *regula fidei*, a text which has come down to us as *On the Trinity* (*De Trinitate*). Scholars have indeed concluded that Novatian's treatise was influenced by Tertullian, with his predecessor's articulation of the Trinity as one substance and three persons grounding his own treatment of the subject.<sup>146</sup>

*Trin.* is in effect an extended commentary on the *regula fidei*.<sup>147</sup> As was the case with *Prax.*, the vast majority of this treatise is exclusively concerned with demonstrating from Scripture the distinction of the Father and the Son, with Novatian going beyond his predecessor by claiming that the Son was not merely pre-existent and coeternal with the Father but also eternally distinct from the Father.<sup>148</sup> Towards the end of this treatise, Novatian briefly gives an account of what it means to believe in the Holy Spirit.<sup>149</sup> Like Tertullian, Novatian here

144 While a full introduction to Novatian's life and theology is beyond the scope of this work, see further Russell J. DeSimone, *The Treatise of Novatian the Roman Presbyter on the Trinity: A Study of the Text and the Doctrine*, SEAug 4 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1970); James L. Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome and the Culmination of Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy*, PTMS (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011).

145 On the Novatian schism, see Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 58–70.

146 Harnack, *History of Dogma*, 2:313–315; DeSimone, *Treatise of Novatian*, 42; Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 106; Simonetti, "Il regresso," 664. Tabula 1A in the front-matter of CCSL vol. 1 also gives *Trin.* as having been influenced by *Prax.* This view was held as early as Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 70 (PL 23:681).

147 DeSimone, *Treatise of Novatian*, 53–54; Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 57; cf. *Trin.* 1.1 (CCSL 4:11). For an overview of the theology of this text, see Geoffrey D. Dunn, "The Diversity and Unity of God in Novatian's *De Trinitate*," *ETL* 78 (2002): 385–409.

148 On Novatian's notion of "eternal generation" and its relationship to Tertullian's Christology, see further Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 33–34.

149 *Trin.* 29 (CCSL 4:69–72).

draws on the Johannine Farewell Discourse to present the Holy Spirit as the Paraclete and the Spirit of Truth before proceeding to describe in considerable detail its sanctifying power.<sup>150</sup> However, Novatian's differences from Tertullian illuminate the direction of this pneumatological trajectory. For example, Novatian does not explicitly affirm the personal existence and divinity of the Spirit as did Tertullian.<sup>151</sup> Moreover, Novatian does not employ prosopological exegesis from the person of the Spirit, as was featured so prominently in *Prax.* 11.7–8. Nor does Novatian portray the Spirit as the preacher of the monarchy or the interpreter of the economy; in fact, the closest Novatian comes to this notion of Trinitarian testimony is his statement that the Spirit is “the revealer of divine things” (*illuminator rerum diuinarum*).<sup>152</sup> In context, however, this likely allusion to 1Cor 2:11, following soon after Novatian's quotation of the Johannine Paraclete passages,<sup>153</sup> places the emphasis on the Spirit's purpose in providing human beings with a correct understanding of Jesus's life and work rather than on its purpose in revealing the divine economy. Thus, though Novatian finds an important role for the Holy Spirit within the Christian life, it is nevertheless fair to speak of a pneumatological decline from the writings of Tertullian to those of Novatian, particularly with respect to the Spirit's role in providing testimony to the other divine persons.

Given Novatian's use of Tertullian and his similar interests in expounding a doctrine of God in contrast to that of modalistic monarchianism, we are forced to provide an explanation for why Novatian has reformulated the role, if not also the nature, of the Spirit away from that articulated by Tertullian. The most likely explanation is Novatian's concern to distinguish himself from his prede-

---

150 Cf. also *Trin.* 16.2–3 (CCCSL 4:40).

151 On the one hand, it has been argued that Novatian applies the term *persona* to the Father and the Son but not the Spirit, and makes no effort to explain the nature of the relationship between the Spirit and the Father and the Son. The lack of any explicit statement identifying the Spirit as a divine person is, therefore, a clear indication that Novatian did not understand the Spirit as such. For this position see Simonetti, “Il regresso,” 657–659. On the other hand, other scholars have argued that Novatian's description of the Spirit's activities seems to presuppose the Spirit is a divine person. For this position, see Russell J. DeSimone, “The Holy Spirit according to Novatian *De Trinitate*,” *Aug* 10 (1970): 360–387, esp. 364–365, 376–379; Papandrea, *Novatian of Rome*, 108–109; Dunn, “Diversity and Unity,” 402. I find Simonetti more persuasive, but in any event even DeSimone (“Holy Spirit,” 380) concludes that “Novatian failed to cull what was profoundest in [Tertullian's] works.”

152 *Trin.* 29.9 (CCSL 4:70).

153 John 14:16–17, 15:26, 16:7, 16:13.

cessor's embrace of the New Prophecy.<sup>154</sup> After all, Cyprian and Novatian do not ever mention the New Prophecy. The most plausible reason for this silence is a decline in the New Prophecy and its appeal in the generation after Tertullian's death. In fact, the Synod of Iconium provides evidence to substantiate this very point. This gathering of Asian bishops ca. 230–235 C.E. condemned the “Cataphrygians,” another name for the followers of the New Prophecy, as heretics.<sup>155</sup> The effects of this synod appear to have been felt as far as North Africa, where the sources suggest a substantial decline in the influence of the movement; as William Tabbernee has argued with respect to Cyprian, his affinity for Tertullian can only be explained by positing that the New Prophecy was no longer a live problem in his own day.<sup>156</sup> As we have seen above, Tertullian's development of the Spirit as a distinct divine person and its role in testifying to the other members of the Trinity was intricately linked to his desire to promote and defend the New Prophecy. As such, if Cyprian and Novatian were determined to leave behind those elements of Tertullian's theology that were most clearly influenced by the New Prophecy, his presentation of the Paraclete and the various aspects of its ministry would almost certainly be foremost among them.

In subsequent decades, this trend to further diminish the Spirit accelerates. Indeed, subsequent writers in the Latin tradition who appear to have been influenced by *Prax.* do not engage with the question of the Spirit's relationship to the Father and the Son, much less its role in providing Trinitarian testi-

---

154 This position is most fully articulated by Simonetti, “Il regresso,” 663–667; likewise Dunn (“Diversity and Unity,” 403) suggests that “perhaps Novatian's mistrust of Tertullian's Montanist leanings may indeed be responsible for his omission of much of Tertullian's theology of the Spirit.” Papandrea (*Novatian of Rome*, 108) dismisses this possibility on account of Novatian still saying “more about the Spirit than would have been required to refute the alternative Christologies of his own time,” but the continued presence of a significant role for the Spirit still allows for its status to be downgraded relative to what Tertullian had described. DeSimone (“Holy Spirit,” 380) allows for the possibility of Novatian needing to distance himself from Tertullian's Montanism as the reason for his less explicit statements concerning the divine personhood of the Spirit.

155 The findings of this synod are reported in a letter from Firmilian to Cyprian ca. 256 C.E., included in collections of Cyprian's correspondence as *Ep.* 75 (CCSL 3C:582–604). Cf. William Tabbernee, “Initiation/Baptism in the Montanist Movement,” in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. David Hellholm, et al., 3 vols., BZNW 176 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 2:917–945, esp. 923 on *Ep.* 75.7 (CCSL 3C:587–589).

156 Tabbernee, “Initiation/Baptism,” 924.

mony.<sup>157</sup> It is of little surprise, then, that the Nicene Creed (325 C.E.) simply states belief in the Holy Spirit with no explanation of its nature or ministry.<sup>158</sup>

### Tertullian: Summary and Implications

In this chapter, we have demonstrated that Tertullian portrays the Spirit as providing testimony to the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son, although he does this less through prosopological exegesis than through his presentation of the workings of the divine economy. On account of the preceding analysis, we can now summarize our answers to the questions posed at the outset of this chapter.

First, concerning how Tertullian develops his understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit with respect to prosopological exegesis, we have seen that as Tertullian gradually adopted more and more of the views of the New Prophecy, he also increasingly identified the Spirit as both a primary speaking agent in its own right as well as the source of Trinitarian testimony to the Father and the Son. However, though Tertullian identifies the Spirit as a participant in intra-divine dialogue, the testifying element of the Spirit's ministry is present only in the content of the quotations themselves and not in Tertullian's surrounding interpretations, marking a distinct discontinuity with both Justin and Irenaeus.

Second, regarding how Tertullian links the Spirit with the notion of Trinitarian testimony in the context of his broader theological constructs and in light of the influence of the New Prophecy, we have concluded that Tertullian's description of the Spirit's ministry in providing Trinitarian testimony is most clearly found in his descriptions of the Spirit's role in the redefined divine economy. Influenced by the teachings of the New Prophecy and motivated by a determination to defend it from criticism, Tertullian portrays the Spirit as a

---

157 See, e.g., Dionysius of Rome's anti-Sabellian polemic, preserved in Athanasius, *Decr.* 26 (PL 5:109–116; PG 25A:461–465), which follows *Prax.* 11 (FC 34:142–148); Lactantius, *Inst.* 4.13, 4.29 (PL 6:482–487, 538–540), which follows *Prax.* 8 (FC 34:130–134). See again Tabula 1A in the front-matter of CCSL vol. 1 for more detailed analysis of the influence of *Prax.* on subsequent Latin writers.

158 Though not a focus of this chapter, it is worth noting that a similar trend may be found among the Greek writers of this time. Apart from an occasional brief statement concerning the Spirit's role in enlightening believers regarding the nature of the Trinity, as at Origen, *Princ.* 2.7.3 (SC 252:330–332), the theme of the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony is not present in extant pre-Nicene Greek literature after the writings of Irenaeus.

distinct divine being who has the purpose of leading believers into a better understanding of the mystery of the Trinity. While this emphasis is a clear point of continuity with Irenaeus before him, the goal of this ministry of the Spirit has shifted from Irenaeus's vision of preparing mankind to share in the Trinitarian life of the Godhead to Tertullian's own exhortation for the Carthaginian Christians to adopt the discipline of the Paraclete.

Third, concerning how Tertullian's immediate successors in the Latin tradition, namely Cyprian and Novatian, appropriated his approach to the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony, we have found that while Cyprian and Novatian believed the Holy Spirit had an important function in the life of the believer, they showed little interest in describing its role in the divine economy, much less in portraying it as a source of Trinitarian testimony. The later Latin tradition through the Council of Nicaea continues this trend of pneumatological decline. The most likely explanation for this phenomenon is that Tertullian's successors were to varying degrees critical of his association with Montanism; indeed, to the extent that Tertullian's description of the Spirit's personhood and its Trinitarian testimony was inextricably linked with his defense of the New Prophecy, we can plausibly surmise that this aspect of his theology was particularly vulnerable to later criticism.

Fourth, with respect to how Tertullian's presentation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit compares with those of Justin and Irenaeus, we have seen that Tertullian follows both Justin and Irenaeus in using prosopological exegesis to identify instances of the Spirit participating in intra-divine dialogue that involves testimony to the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son; however, Tertullian makes this point only implicitly with respect to the language of the quoted texts themselves, whereas his predecessors demonstrated this in their surrounding interpretations of the quotations assigned to the Spirit. Likewise, we have seen that Tertullian follows Irenaeus in assigning the Spirit a role in the divine economy that involves leading believers into a better understanding of the Triune God; again, however, Tertullian goes his own way in focusing on how this relates to the ascetic teachings of the New Prophecy. In sum, then, it appears that Tertullian drew upon this pneumatological trajectory even as he adapted it and made it his own to reflect his unique historical context and theological concerns.

Having completed our analysis of Tertullian's presentation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, we can now consider the implications of these findings for the future development of Christian pneumatology. Despite Tertullian's inability to convince his immediate successors in the Latin tradition to adopt some of his distinctive pneumatological ideas, his description of the Spirit as one of the three divine persons who comprise the Triune God would in fact

set the foundation for later pro-Nicene Trinitarian theology. For instance, that most famous of all Western theologians, Augustine of Hippo, characterizes the unity and diversity of God in terms that hearken back to those of his North African predecessor, describing the Triune God with the terminology of three persons and one substance.<sup>159</sup> By this time, however, the roots of the word *persona* in prosopological exegesis, as so distinctively highlighted by Tertullian, have largely disappeared in favor of a more technical notion of *persona*.<sup>160</sup> What began as an attempt to read the Hebrew Scriptures prosopologically, discerning the distinct identities of first the Father and the Son and then also the Spirit as speaking *πρόσωπα*, has provided the terminology as well as a biblical justification for differentiating the three *personae* within the Godhead.<sup>161</sup> Thus, while later writers such as Augustine would retain and develop Tertullian's presentation of the Holy Spirit as one of the three divine persons comprising the Triune God, the relationship between the Spirit's personality and its role in testifying to the other divine persons in the theodrama has been completely obscured. In other words, the link between the Spirit's prosopological speech and its Trinitarian testimony, already partially severed in the writings of Tertullian, would not be restored.

Beyond this, the conclusions reached in this chapter have further consequences for our understanding of the development of pneumatology in the pre-Nicene period. With respect to the traditional narrative of the development of early Christian pneumatology, the diminishing importance of the Spirit in the Latin tradition after Tertullian, likely on account of the association between some of Tertullian's pneumatological proposals and his belief in the New Prophecy, suggests that the theology of the Spirit did not develop in a consistently forward direction. This recognition is, of course, one of the great strengths of the Ayres-Barnes model, but this chapter also challenges aspects of that approach. Indeed, there is little question that Tertullian's pneumatology has shifted away from more Jewish foundations to a new approach grounded in the notion of grade or order, but this chapter has revealed that there are still some important continuities between the pneumatologies of Irenaeus and Tertullian that must not be dismissed. Even though Tertullian develops his understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit away from an explicit

159 *Trin.* 5.8.9 (CCSL 50:216).

160 Indeed, later writers such as Hilary of Poitiers explicitly rejected the theatrical sense of the term *persona* that undergirded the prosopological exegesis of early Christian writers like Justin; see Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 183 and 183 n. 47.

161 See again Bates, *Birth*, 36–40.

connection with prosopological exegesis, the parallels to Irenaeus, both with respect to his use of prosopological exegesis from the person of the Spirit as well as to his basic presentation of the divine economy, suggest that Tertullian's pneumatology was still deeply indebted to that of Irenaeus.

This brings us to an end of our study of the three most significant figures in the development of the notion of the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony in the pre-Nicene period. We are now in position to synthesize our conclusions and analyze their significance for the study of prosopological exegesis and the development of pre-Nicene pneumatology.

## Conclusion

In the context of renewed interest in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit among both scholars and church leaders, this book has proposed a fresh approach to the study of the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In particular, this study has aimed to provide an explanation for how and why pre-Nicene Christian writers utilized the words of Scripture and the conventions of ancient rhetoric to link the Spirit with the notion of testimony to the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son, a concept which has herein been termed the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. Now, at the conclusion of this book, we are at last in a position to synthesize its findings and draw some general conclusions, taking each of the central guiding questions set out in the introduction of this book and answering them in light of the findings of the above chapters.

First, concerning the basis on which early Christian writers could appeal to the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit and the forms that this testimony could take, we have demonstrated that figures such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyons, and Tertullian of Carthage all employed an ancient reading strategy known as prosopological exegesis, which seeks to identify various “persons” as speakers or addressees of texts in which they are otherwise ambiguous. Immersed in Israel’s Scriptures, one way in which these writers utilized this method was to identify passages in the Old Testament that, they argued, portrayed the Spirit as providing testimony to the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son.<sup>1</sup> Put another way, the basis of these writers’ appeal to the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit has three components: the exegetical methods of classical rhetoric, the sacred texts of ancient Israel, and the binitarianism or nascent Trinitarianism of this stream of early Christianity. All three of these components were vital, necessary elements in constructing this particular pneumatological innovation by allowing for a new reading of key Old Testament passages that could accommodate a plurality of divine persons within the Godhead.

Though the basis for the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit remained constant, the form of this testimony could vary. In other words, though the Spirit was always identified as the ultimate source of Trinitarian testimony, its testimony could involve speaking to one divine person concerning another, reporting the words of one divine person to another, or (rarely) speaking through

---

1 These key texts are again Justin, *Dial.* 56.14–15 (PTS 47:164–165); Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.6.1 (SC 211:64–68); Tertullian, *Prax.* 11.7–8 (FC 34:146–148).



TABLE 15 *The Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit in Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian*

Scripture	Justin	Irenaeus	Tertullian	Summary
Gen 19:24	×	×		Trinitarian Testimony—Secondary
	<i>Dial.</i> 56.14 (PTS 47:164)	<i>Haer.</i> 3.6.1 (SC 211:66)		Father and Son are Lord Spirit speaks in narrative description
Ps 45:6–7	×	×		Trinitarian Testimony—Primary
	<i>Dial.</i> 56.14 (PTS 47:164)	<i>Haer.</i> 3.6.1 (SC 211:66)		Father and Son are God Spirit speaks directly to Son
Ps 50:1, 3		×		Trinitarian Testimony—Secondary
		<i>Haer.</i> 3.6.1 (SC 211:68)		Father and Son are Lord and God Spirit speaks to unknown audience
Ps 82:1		×		Trinitarian Testimony—Secondary
		<i>Haer.</i> 3.6.1 (SC 211:66)		Father and Son are God Spirit speaks to unknown audience
Ps 110:1	×	×	×	Trinitarian Testimony—Primary
	<i>Dial.</i> 56.14 (PTS 47:164)	<i>Haer.</i> 3.6.1 (SC 211:64)	<i>Prax.</i> 11.7 (FC 34:146)	Father and Son are Lord Spirit speaks Father's words to Son
Isa 45:1			×	Trinitarian Testimony—Primary
			<i>Prax.</i> 11.8 (FC 34:148)	Father and Son are Lord Spirit speaks Father's words to Son

third-person narrative description. The content of this testimony, which ascribes the qualities of deity and lordship to the Father and the Son, is consistent across all of these different ways in which the Spirit could be said to speak through Israel's Scriptures. In most of these instances, the Spirit is portrayed as a speaking person (*πρόσωπον*; *persona*) in its own right, able to go beyond merely inspiring the words of Scripture to actually participating as a conversation partner in the divine theodrama. All of the instances of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit identified in this book are summarized in Table 15 above.

An analysis of this table yields a few interesting insights concerning the passages which are interpreted as the Spirit testifying to the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son. First, Ps 110:1 is the only passage employed by all three writers for this purpose, demonstrating the importance of this verse for not just the development of Christology, upon which scholarly interest has traditionally focused, but for the development of pneumatology as well. After Ps 110:1, only Gen 19:24 and Ps 45:6–7 appear more than once, underscoring the diversity of

Old Testament texts that could be employed for this purpose. Second, the Spirit functions as a primary speaking agent in every instance in which it participates in or reports intra-divine dialogue; on rare occasion, its testimony can occur in its capacity as an inspiring secondary agent. In other words, the personality of the Spirit comes to the forefront most clearly when it is its own distinct actor in the divine theodrama. Pulling these two insights together, it is striking that while the core concept remains consistent through all of these instances—namely, that the Spirit testifies to the divinity or lordship of the Father and the Son through the words of the Old Testament—the specific passages used and the manner in which the Spirit testifies are categories that appear to have been quite flexible. Thus, it is ultimately the content of the Spirit's testimony, and not the manner in which it testifies, that is at the heart of what this book calls the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. Further, careful analysis of each writer's use of prosopological exegesis with respect to the other divine persons has demonstrated that this form of testimony is indeed unique to the Spirit.

Second, with respect to how early Christian understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit developed in light of each successive writer's specific theological and historical contexts, we have seen that several of the foundational theological insights for this pneumatological development—including the characterizations of the Spirit as a primary speaking agent, a provider of authoritative, reliable testimony, and a provider of testimony to or concerning other divine beings—were present in the writings that would be later canonized as the New Testament. Still, it was ultimately Justin Martyr who would synthesize these different elements in order to construct a distinctively Christian understanding of God that presented the Spirit as testifying to the Father and the Son as true God and true Lord. Justin's portrayal of the Spirit's Trinitarian testimony most likely emerged in the context of his engagement with Judaism, with Justin desiring to fashion a Christian self-identity that was distinct from Judaism as he constructed it. Indeed, by identifying the Spirit, which held such a significant role in the worship and life of his Christian community, as the source of testimony to the beliefs that would come to distinguish Christians from Jews, Justin solidified the theological distinctives of his religious community while paving the way for future pneumatological developments in this regard.

A generation later, Irenaeus of Lyons would further refine Justin's understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, clarifying and expanding the precise nature of this testimony by expanding the range of terms used to describe this action of the Spirit and by setting out contrasts with other forms of testimony from the Father and the Son. Irenaeus would, however, shift its application to a different polemical context from that of his predecessor, focusing

on limiting rather than expanding the potential referents for the terms “God” and “Lord.” In addition, Irenaeus moved beyond Justin by identifying the Spirit as the source of revelation concerning the divine economy and the means by which human beings are prepared to share in the Trinitarian life of the Godhead. These theological developments resulted from Irenaeus’s competition with the Gnostics over the question of religious authority; to the extent that Irenaeus offered access to a Holy Spirit who would in turn offer some degree of access to the true fount of divinity, he turned the tables on the Gnostics and their own claims to have exclusive access, by the Spirit, to knowledge of the true God.

Standing at the end of this sequence, Tertullian of Carthage would employ, with significant modifications, his predecessors’ understandings of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. Unlike Justin and Irenaeus, when Tertullian portrays the Spirit as participating in intra-divine dialogue, the testifying function of the Spirit is only implicit in the quotations themselves and not in Tertullian’s own introduction or explanation of those quotations. Instead, Tertullian’s understanding of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit is most clearly stated apart from his portrayal of the Spirit’s prosopological speech. This pneumatological advance was inextricably linked with his support of the New Prophecy, which contributed to a more explicit portrayal of the Spirit as a Trinitarian person. Thus, because his use of prosopological exegesis only implicitly brought out the Spirit’s testifying role, as well as on account of his association with Montanism, Tertullian paved the way for the eventual diminishment of this aspect of the Spirit’s ministry in the later pre-Nicene Latin tradition. Still, Tertullian’s clear identification of the Spirit as a distinct divine person tasked with leading believers into a better understanding of the mystery of the Trinity both demonstrates thematic continuity with his predecessors as well as sets the stage for later pro-Nicene Trinitarian theology.

In each case, therefore, the individual writer’s presentation of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit encompasses both his reception of earlier pneumatological ideas as well as his adaptation of them in light of his context—a context which is, in every instance, characterized by engagement with the ideas of Judaism and other “Christianities” of the pre-Nicene period, underscoring the importance of “heretical” forms of the faith in the construction of the “orthodox” doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Third, regarding the implications of these findings for modern scholarly inquiry into the development of early Christian pneumatology, the conclusions of this book challenge both of the major approaches to the study of the development of pre-Nicene pneumatology, which were summarized in the introduction to this book. In contrast to the traditional view, which posits a “slow

and steady” refinement of early Christian pneumatology and therefore finds little significance in Christian writers from the first three centuries of the Common Era, this book has demonstrated that some of these writers in fact made major contributions to this aspect of theology. In particular, Justin, who is especially marginalized in treatments of the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, emerges from this study as a pneumatological innovator who used prosopological exegesis to identify the Spirit as the unique source of testimony to the divinity and lordship of the Father and the Son, paving the way for an understanding of the Spirit as a divine person in its own right. Not only that, but Justin’s use of terms such as *θεολογέω* and *κυριολογέω* would have implications for later pro-Nicene discourse about the nature of the Spirit, as found in the writings of figures such as Athanasius and Basil of Caesarea. For his part, Irenaeus refined and extended Justin’s notion of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, moving beyond just prosopological exegesis to describing how the Spirit functions within the divine economy to reveal and allow for the participation of humankind in the inner life of the Trinity. Irenaeus’s influence was felt beyond the pre-Nicene period, with pro-Nicene writers such as Gregory of Nazianzus building on some of Irenaeus’s most important pneumatological insights to develop their own understandings of the nature and function of the Holy Spirit. Finally, Tertullian continues to develop this notion of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit, connecting his use of prosopological exegesis to his identification of the Spirit as a distinct divine *persona*, with the literary roots of this term obscured in favor of a more explicit claim regarding the inner life of God. Though the terminology would shift, especially in the Greek tradition, Tertullian’s presentation of the Spirit as one of the three divine persons who comprise the Triune God represented a major step on the way to Nicaea, even providing inspiration to later figures such as Augustine. In sum, each of the major pre-Nicene figures studied in this book crafted important pneumatological ideas that would ultimately contribute to the development of the pro-Nicene view of the Spirit. The traditional view of the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit therefore wrongly discounts the significance of these early Christian thinkers, especially Justin, who inaugurated this entire approach to the Spirit and its role in testifying to the divinity and lordship of the other divine persons.

Likewise, this study suggests that the Ayres-Barnes approach to the development of early Christian pneumatology, which I believe to be a vast improvement over the traditional view, is also in need of some refinement to more adequately reflect the complexity of the pre-Nicene period. With respect to Justin, this model downplays the significance of Justin’s contribution to the development of a distinctively Christian pneumatology. This book, however, has shown

Justin's description of the Spirit as capable of speaking from its own person in order to provide testimony to the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son to be a landmark pneumatological innovation, initiating a theological trajectory that would have implications for the development of pneumatology not only among his immediate pre-Nicene successors but also among fourth-century pro-Nicene writers who sought to assert the full deity of the Spirit. Furthermore, concerning Irenaeus, to the extent that the Ayres-Barnes model focuses exclusively on Irenaeus's adoption of Jewish ideas concerning the Spirit, it fails to give proper consideration to other influences, such as distinctively Christian ideas transmitted from Justin or even theological insights adapted from his Gnostic opponents. Finally, this study has shown that the Ayres-Barnes schema has placed too strong of a wall between Tertullian and his predecessors Justin and Irenaeus. While it is certainly the case that Tertullian's pneumatology exhibits some very important discontinuities from his predecessors' views of the Spirit, this study has also shown an example of significant continuity among these figures on the subject of the Trinitarian testimony of the Spirit. Indeed, it is only in the subsequent generation of the Latin tradition that we find an end to this particular theological trajectory.

Fourth, regarding the implications of these findings for modern scholarly inquiry into the place of prosopological exegesis in early Christianity, we have noted that while recent scholarship has demonstrated the importance of prosopological exegesis for the development of the doctrine of the Trinity, as summarized in the introduction to this book, these studies have focused almost exclusively on how prosopological exegesis was used to illustrate the binitarian relationship between the Father and the Son. In contrast, this book has extended the study of prosopological exegesis to be inclusive of the Spirit as a third participant in intra-divine conversations. In particular, we have found that prosopological exegesis of certain Old Testament dialogical passages presented the Holy Spirit as a primary speaking agent, endowing upon it a greater degree of theodramatic personhood than when it functions as an inspiring secondary agent. Changes in how prosopological exegesis was used and understood further sharpened early Christian writers' presentation of the Spirit's personhood; whereas Justin and Irenaeus employed prosopological exegesis with its theatrical or literary origins in view, Tertullian attempted to bring the notion of divine personhood out of this sphere and into a discussion of the internal dynamics of the Godhead. As the earlier way of thinking about prosopological exegesis left itself open to being utilized by the proponents of modalistic monarchianism, Tertullian's employment of this reading strategy required making clear that Father, Son, and Spirit were in fact fully distinct divine persons. Though the Greek Fathers would nevertheless replace *persona*

with *hypostasis* in order to further safeguard against modalist or Sabellian understandings of the Trinity, Tertullian nevertheless played a decisive role in ensuring that the metaphor of one substance in three persons would become the normative grammar for later pro-Nicene Trinitarian theology. By tracing how the Spirit was first identified by Justin and Irenaeus as a distinct speaking person within the divine theodrama to how the language of “person” was applied to the Spirit in Tertullian and beyond, this book provides further support for Matthew Bates’s account of “Trinitarianism by continuity in prosopological exegesis.”

Having said this, it is necessary to point out that the conclusions of this book must not be overstated. Prosopological exegesis was by no means the exclusive reason why the Holy Spirit came to be identified as a distinct divine person within the Godhead; indeed, from the time of the earliest Christians, the experience of the Spirit in the charismatic life of the Church and the place of the Spirit in the Church’s early creeds and baptismal formulas played significant roles in constructing a distinctively Christian pneumatology. Still, the unique contribution of prosopological exegesis for early Christian views of the Spirit is that it provided a scriptural warrant for the use of “person” language that would eventually be identified as the predominant metaphor for speaking of diversity within the Godhead. It is even possible that a prosopological reading of Old Testament dialogical texts such as Ps 110:1 provided a theological pressure that contributed to the development of Trinitarian, and not merely binitarian, theology insofar as only a third divine person—the Spirit—would be qualified to make true testimony concerning the deity and lordship of the Father and the Son. If, however, it is indeed the case that Justin was the first person to elevate the Spirit to the role of a distinct person within the divine theodrama, it would appear more plausible that the early church’s experience of the Spirit preceded and informed its reading of Scripture rather than the other way around.

In closing, I would like to offer some signposts for other researchers interested in further engaging the topics explored in this book. In particular, the recent round of conversation about the use and significance of prosopological exegesis in early Christianity almost certainly has not yet run its full course. I offer the many tables of instances of prosopological exegesis from the various divine persons as a helpful tool for researchers interested in discovering additional patterns and trends from this data. More specifically, with respect to the Spirit’s prosopological speech and Trinitarian testimony, this book has focused on its instantiation within one particular theological trajectory of early Christianity. This same theme could also, I believe, be profitably traced in other authors and compared with the conclusions of this book. For instance, we find in the early Alexandrian writers Clement and Origen frequent references to

the Spirit speaking or even singing through Scripture. Though at first glance it appears that these instances are likely all examples of the Spirit speaking as an inspiring secondary agent, further analysis would certainly be helpful in bringing greater clarity to the matter. Origen's references to the Spirit's role in revealing the other divine persons appear to be developed on the basis of a different theological superstructure apart from prosopological exegesis,<sup>2</sup> but again further research could help clarify potential similarities to what we have explored in this book. Likewise, the extension of this investigation into fourth-century writers, such as Athanasius or the Cappadocians, could perhaps yield further profit. I have identified some preliminary points of continuity at the conclusion of each chapter in this book, but I suspect this is merely scratching the surface. It is only with such further research that we will succeed in reaching a more complete understanding of the development of early Christian pneumatology and the role of prosopological exegesis in that process.

---

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., *Princ.* 1.3.4, 2.7.3–4 (SC 252:148–152, 330–334). Origen does make some important statements concerning prosopological exegesis at *Philoc.* 7 (Robinson, 50–51) and *Comm. Rom.* 2.11.2–3 (FC 2/1:236–238), but it appears that he limits the Spirit's prosopological speech to that of an inspiring secondary agent. In the subsequent Origenist tradition, see also Methodius of Olympus, *Symp.* 8.11 (SC 95:228).





# Bibliography

## Primary Sources

### *Justin Martyr*

- Falls, Thomas B., trans. *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*. Revised by Thomas P. Halton. Edited by Michael Slusser. Selections from the Fathers of the Church 3. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.
- Marcovich, Miroslav, ed. *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*. Patristische Texte und Studien 47. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997.
- Minns, Denis, and Paul Parvis, eds. and trans. *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Munier, Charles, ed. and trans. *Justin: Apologie pour les chrétiens*. Sources Chrétiennes 507. Paris: Cerf, 2006.

### *Irenaeus of Lyons*

- Behr, John, intro. and trans. *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: On the Apostolic Preaching*. Popular Patristics Series 17. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997.
- Robinson, J. Armitage, intro. and trans. *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*. London: SPCK, 1920.
- Rousseau, Adelin, and Louis Doutreleau, eds. and trans. *Contre les hérésies 1.1 and 2*. Sources Chrétiennes 263 and 264. Paris: Cerf, 1972.
- Rousseau, Adelin, and Louis Doutreleau, eds. and trans. *Contre les hérésies 2.1 and 2*. Sources Chrétiennes 293 and 294. Paris: Cerf, 1982.
- Rousseau, Adelin, and Louis Doutreleau, eds. and trans. *Contre les hérésies 3.1 and 2*. Sources Chrétiennes 210 and 211. Paris: Cerf, 1974.
- Rousseau, Adelin, et al., eds. and trans. *Contre les hérésies 4.1 and 2*. Sources Chrétiennes 100.1 and 100.2. Paris: Cerf, 1965.
- Rousseau, Adelin, Louis Doutreleau, and Charles Mercier, eds. and trans. *Contre les hérésies 5.1 and 2*. Sources Chrétiennes 152 and 153. Paris: Cerf, 1969.
- Rousseau, Adelin, ed. and trans. *Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*. Sources Chrétiennes 406. Paris: Cerf, 1995.
- Steenberg, M.C. Irenaeus, rev. *St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies, Book 3*. Translated by Dominic J. Unger. Ancient Christian Writers 64. New York: Newman, 2012.

### *Tertullian*

- Braun, René, ed. and trans. *Tertullien: Contre Marcion, Livres I–IV*. Sources Chrétiennes 365, 368, 399, 456. Paris: Cerf, 1990–2001.
- Chapot, Frédéric, ed. and trans. *Tertullien: Contre Hermogène*. Sources Chrétiennes 439. Paris: Cerf, 1999.

- Evans, Ernest, ed. and trans. *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Evans, Ernest, ed. and trans. *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. London: SPCK, 1948. Repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011.
- Fredouille, Jean-Claude, ed. and trans. *Tertullien: De la patience*. Sources Chrétiennes 310. Paris: Cerf, 1999.
- Hauses, Regina, ed. and trans. *Tertullian: Adversus Iudaeos*. Fontes Christiani 75. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
- Moreschini, Claudio, ed. *Tertullien: Exhortation a la chasteté*. Sources Chrétiennes 319. Translated by Jean-Claude Fredouille. Paris: Cerf, 1985.
- Munier, Charles, ed. and trans. *Tertullien: Le pudicité*. Sources Chrétiennes 394. Paris: Cerf, 1993.
- Refoulé, R.F., ed. *Tertullien: Traité de la prescription contre les Hérétiques*. Translated by P. de Labriolle. Sources Chrétiennes 46. Paris: Cerf, 1957.
- Sieben, Hermann-Josef, trans. *Tertullian: Adversus Praxeas—Gegen Praxeas*. Fontes Christiani 34. Freiburg: Herder, 2001.

### *Other*

- Aland, Barbara, et al., eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- Bardy, Gustave, ed. and trans. *Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire ecclésiastique*. 4 vols. Sources Chrétiennes 31, 41, 55, 73. Paris: Cerf, 1952–1960.
- Blanc, Cécile, ed. and trans. *Origène: Commentaire sur saint Jean*. 5 vols. Sources Chrétiennes 120, 157, 222, 290, 385. Paris: Cerf, 1966–1982.
- Corpus Christianorum: Series Apocryphorum. Turnhout: Brepols, 1983–.
- Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953–.
- Crouzel, Henri, and Manlio Simonetti, eds. and trans. *Origène: Traité des principes: Tome 1 (Livres I et II)*. Sources Chrétiennes 252. Paris: Cerf, 1978.
- DelCogliano, Mark, Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, and Lewis Ayres, trans. and intro. *Works on the Spirit: Athanasius the Great and Didymus the Blind*. Popular Patristics Series 43. Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2011.
- Ehrman, Bart D., ed. and trans. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Loeb Classical Library 24–25. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Gallay, Paul, ed. and trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 27–31 (Discours théologiques)*. Sources Chrétiennes 250. Paris: Cerf, 1978.
- Heither, Theresia, ed. and trans. *Origenes: Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos*. Fontes Christiani 2/1–6. Freiburg: Herder, 1990–1999.
- Hubbell, H.M., ed. and trans. *Cicero: De inventione, De optimo genere oratorum, Topica*. Loeb Classical Library 386. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.

- Kennedy, George A., trans. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Marcovich, Miroslav, ed. *Athenagoras Legatio pro Christianis*. Patristische Texte und Studien 31. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990.
- Marcovich, Miroslav, ed. *Hippolytus Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*. Patristische Texte und Studien 25. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986.
- Marcovich, Miroslav, ed. *Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos*. Patristische Texte und Studien 43. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995.
- Marcovich, Miroslav, ed. *Theophili Antiocheni ad Autolycum*. Patristische Texte und Studien 44. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995.
- Migne, J.-P., ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca*. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886.
- Migne, J.-P., ed. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina*. 217 vols. Paris, 1844–1864.
- Moreschini, Claudio, ed. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 38–41*. Translated by Paul Gallay. Sources Chrétiennes 358. Paris: Cerf, 1990.
- Mossay, Justin, ed. and trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 20–23*. Sources Chrétiennes 270. Paris: Cerf, 1980.
- Musurillo, Herbert, ed. and intro. *Méthode d'Olympe: Le banquet*. Translated by Victor-Henry Debidour. Sources Chrétiennes 95. Paris: Cerf, 1963.
- Neusner, Jacob, trans. *Bavli Tractate Sanhedrin: Chapters 1 through VII*. Vol. 23A of *The Talmud of Babylonia: An Academic Commentary*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Pouderon, Bernard, et al., eds. and trans. *Aristide: Apologie*. Sources Chrétiennes 470. Paris: Cerf, 2003.
- Pruche, Benoît, ed. and trans. *Basile de Césarée: Sur le Saint-Esprit*. Sources Chrétiennes 17 bis. Paris: Cerf, 1968.
- Robinson, J. Armitage, ed. and intro. *The Philocalia of Origen: The Text Revised with a Critical Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893.
- Russell, Donald A., ed. and trans. *Quintilian: The Orator's Education Books 9–10*. Loeb Classical Library 127. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

## Secondary Sources

- Abasciano, Brian J. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9:1–9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis*. Library of New Testament Studies 301. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Albl, Martin C. *"And Scripture Cannot Be Broken": The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 46. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Allert, Craig D. *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 64. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

- Allison, Dale C. *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Allison, Gregg R. *Historical Theology: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.
- Anatolios, Khaled. *Retrieving Nicaea: The Development and Meaning of Trinitarian Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Andresen, Carl. "Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personbegriffes." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 52 (1961): 1–39.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.
- Aune, David E. "Justin Martyr's Use of the Old Testament." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 9 (1966): 179–197.
- Ayres, Lewis. "Innovation and Ressourcement in Pro-Nicene Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 187–206.
- Ayres, Lewis. *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Ayres, Lewis. "Spiritus Amborum: Augustine and Pro-Nicene Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 207–221.
- Ayres, Lewis, and Michel René Barnes. "Conclusions." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 235–236.
- Ayres, Lewis, and Michel René Barnes. "Pneumatology: Historical and Methodological Considerations." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 163–236.
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory*. Translated by Graham Harrison. 5 vols. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992.
- Barnard, L.W. *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Barnard, L.W. "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr." *Vetus Testamentum* 14 (1964): 395–406.
- Barnes, Michel René. "Augustine's Last Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 223–234.
- Barnes, Michel René. "The Beginning and End of Early Christian Pneumatology." *Augustinian Studies* 39 (2008): 169–186.
- Barnes, Michel René. "Irenaeus's Trinitarian Theology." *Nova et Vetera* 7 (2009): 67–106.
- Barnes, Timothy David. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.
- Barrett, C.K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Black, 1968.
- Barrett, C.K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1958.
- Bates, Matthew W. *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and*

- Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Bates, Matthew W. *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Interpretation*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012.
- Bates, Matthew W. "Justin Martyr's Logocentric Hermeneutical Transformation of Isaiah's Vision of the Nations." *Journal of Theological Studies* 60 (2009): 538–555.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971. Translation of *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im älteren Christentum*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 10. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934.
- Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Beeley, Christopher A. "The Holy Spirit in Gregory Nazianzen: The Pneumatology of Oration 31." Pages 151–162 in *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Memory of Lloyd G. Patterson*. Edited by Andrew B. McGowan, Brian E. Daley, and Timothy J. Gaden. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 94. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Behr, John. *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Behr, John. *Irenaeus of Lyons: Identifying Christianity*. Christian Theology in Context. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Behr, John. *The Way to Nicaea*. Vol. 1 of *Formation of Christian Theology*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.
- Bekken, Per Jarle. *The Lawsuit Motif in John's Gospel from New Perspectives: Jesus Christ, Crucified Criminal and Emperor of the World*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 158. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Bennema, Cornelis. *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/148. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Bergian, Silke-Petra. "How to Speak about Early Christian Apologetic Literature? Comments on the Recent Debate." *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001): 177–183.
- Bethune-Baker, J.F. *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon*. London: Methuen, 1903.
- Blackman, E.C. *Marcion and His Influence*. London: SPCK, 1948.
- Blackwell, Ben C. *Christosis: Pauline Soteriology in Light of Deification in Irenaeus and Cyril of Alexandria*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/314. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Blowers, Paul M. *The Drama of the Divine Economy: Creator and Creation in Early Christian Theology and Piety*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

- Blowers, Paul M. "The *Regula Fidei* and the Narrative Character of Early Christian Faith." *Pro Ecclesia* 6 (1997): 199–228.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990. Repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Divinations. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Boyarin, Daniel. "Justin Martyr Invents Judaism." *Church History* 70 (2001): 427–461.
- Brakke, David. *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Bray, Gerald. *Holiness and the Will of God: Perspectives on the Theology of Tertullian*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1979.
- Breck, John. *Spirit of Truth: The Origins of Johannine Pneumatology*. Vol. 1 of *Spirit of Truth: The Holy Spirit in Johannine Tradition*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991.
- Brent, Allen. *Cyprian and Roman Carthage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Brent, Allen. *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop*. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 31. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Briggman, Anthony. *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Briggman, Anthony. "Literary and Rhetorical Theory in Irenaeus, Part 1." *Vigiliae Christianae* 69 (2015): 500–527.
- Briggman, Anthony. "Measuring Justin's Approach to the Spirit: Trinitarian Conviction and Binitarian Orientation." *Vigiliae Christianae* 63 (2009): 107–137.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Epistles of John*. Anchor Bible 30. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel according to John I–XII*. Anchor Bible 29. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel according to John XIII–XXI*. Anchor Bible 29A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970.
- Brown, Tricia Gates. *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-Scientific Perspective*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 253. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Brunt, John C. "More on the *Topos* as a New Testament Form." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 495–500.
- Bucur, Bogdan G. "The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity: Justin, the Martyr and Philosopher." *Journal of Religion* 88 (2008): 190–208.

- Bucur, Bogdan G. *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses*. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 95. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Bucur, Bogdan G. "Justin Martyr's Exegesis of Biblical Theophanies and the Parting of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism." *Theological Studies* 75 (2014): 34–51.
- Bucur, Bogdan G. "Revisiting Christian Oeyen: 'The Other Clement' on Father, Son, and the Angelomorphic Spirit." *Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (2007): 381–413.
- Burge, Gary M. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Burgess, Stanley M. *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.
- Burns, J. Patout, Jr. *Cyprian the Bishop*. Routledge Early Church Monographs. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Burns, J. Patout, Jr., and Robin M. Jensen. *Christianity in Roman Africa: The Development of Its Practices and Beliefs*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Castelo, Daniel. *Pneumatology: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 4 (1965): 275–297.
- Collins, Paul M. *The Trinity: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina 7. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Cosgrove, Charles H. "Justin Martyr and the Emerging New Testament Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho." *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982): 209–232.
- Daley, Brian E. "'One Thing and Another': The Persons in God and the Person of Christ in Patristic Theology." *Pro Ecclesia* 15 (2006): 17–46.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Origins of Latin Christianity*. Vol. 3 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*. Translated by David Smith and John A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1977.
- Daniélou, Jean. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. Vol. 1 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*. Translated and edited by John A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.
- Decret, François. *Early Christianity in North Africa*. Translated by Edward L. Smither. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2009.
- DeSimone, Russell J. "The Holy Spirit according to Novatian *De Trinitate*." *Augustinianum* 10 (1970): 360–387.
- DeSimone, Russell J. *The Treatise of Novatian the Roman Presbyter on the Trinity: A Study of the Text and the Doctrine*. Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 4. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1970.

- Desjardins, Michel R. *Sin in Valentinianism*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 108. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- De Wet, Chris L. "Emancipating the Spirit: Slavery in Basil of Caesarea's *De Spiritu Sancto*." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Atlanta, November 2015.
- Dodd, C.H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.
- Donovan, Mary Ann. *One Right Reading? A Guide to Irenaeus*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.
- Downs, David J. "Prosopological Exegesis in Cyprian's *De opere et eleemosynis*." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 6 (2012): 279–294.
- Droge, Arthur J. "Justin Martyr and the Restoration of Philosophy." *Church History* 56 (1987): 303–319.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. "The Diversity and Unity of God in Novatian's *De Trinitate*." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 78 (2002): 385–409.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. *Tertullian*. The Early Church Fathers. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Dunn, James D.G. *Jesus Remembered*. Vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Dunn, James D.G. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1975.
- Dunn, James D.G. "Tertullian and Paul on the Spirit of Prophecy." Pages 72–78 in *Tertullian and Paul*. Edited by Todd D. Still and David E. Willhite. Vol. 1 of *Pauline and Patristic Scholars in Debate*. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- Dunn, James D.G. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*. 3rd ed. London: SCM, 2006.
- Edwards, Mark J. "Exegesis and the Early Christian Doctrine of the Trinity." Pages 80–91 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Edwards, Mark J. "Justin's Logos and the Word of God." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995): 261–280.
- Edwards, Mark J. "On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr." *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 17–34.
- Edwards, Mark J., Martin Goodman, and Simon Price. "Introduction: Apologetics in the Roman World." Pages 1–13 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Emmrich, Martin. "Pneuma in Hebrews: Prophet and Interpreter." *Westminster Theological Journal* 63 (2002): 55–71.
- Enslin, Morton S. "Irenaeus: Mostly Prolegomena." *Harvard Theological Review* 40 (1947): 137–165.



- Evans, Robert F. *One and Holy: The Church in Latin Patristic Thought*. London: SPCK, 1972.
- Fahey, Michael Andrew. *Cyprian and the Bible: A Study in Third-Century Exegesis*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik 9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971.
- Fantino, Jacques. *La théologie d'Irénée: Lecture des Écritures en réponse à l'exégèse gnostique: Une approche trinitaire*. Paris: Cerf, 1994.
- Fay, Ron C. "Was Paul a Trinitarian? A Look at Romans 8." Pages 327–345 in *Paul and His Theology*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Pauline Studies 3. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Fee, Gordon D. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Ferguson, Everett. *The Rule of Faith: A Guide*. Cascade Companions 20. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015.
- Foster, Paul. "Justin and Paul." Pages 108–125 in *Paul and the Second Century*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson. Library of New Testament Studies 412. London: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Foster, Paul, and Sara Parvis, eds. *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Fredouille, Jean-Claude. *Tertullien et la conversion de la culture antique*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1972.
- Freeman, David Noel, ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Freund, Richard A. "The Apocalypse according to the Rabbis: Divergent Rabbinic Views on the End of Days." Pages 115–133 in *Millennialism from the Hebrew Bible to the Present*. Edited by Leonard J. Greenspoon and Ronald A. Simkins. Studies in Jewish Civilization 12. Omaha, NE: Creighton University Press, 2002.
- Gabriel, Andrew K. "Pauline Pneumatology and the Question of Trinitarian Presuppositions." Pages 347–362 in *Paul and His Theology*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Pauline Studies 3. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. *The Theology of Justin Martyr*. Jena: Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923. Repr., Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. *Index Apologeticus*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912.
- Grant, Robert M. *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.
- Grant, Robert M. *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1998.
- Grant, Robert M. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. The Early Church Fathers. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

- Gregory, Andrew F., and Christopher M. Tuckett. "Reflections on Method: What Constitutes the Use of the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers?" Pages 61–82 in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Harnack, Adolf. *History of Dogma*. Translated from the 3rd German ed. by Neil Buchanan. 7 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, 1896–1905.
- Harnack, Adolf. *Marcion: Das Evangelium von Fremden Gott*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921.
- Harvey, A.E. *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1976.
- Hay, David M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 18. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.
- Haykin, Michael A.G. *The Exegesis of 1 and 2 Corinthians in the Pneumatomachian Controversy of the Fourth Century*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 27. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Haykin, Michael A.G. "The Holy Spirit in Cyprian's *To Donatus*." *Evangelical Quarterly* 83 (2011): 321–329.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Heine, Ronald E. *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*. North American Patristic Society Patristic Monograph Series. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989.
- Heine, Ronald E. "The Role of the Gospel of John in the Montanist Controversy." *Second Century* 6 (1987): 1–19.
- Henne, Philippe. *Tertullien l'Africain*. Paris: Cerf, 2011.
- Hildebrand, Stephen M. *The Trinitarian Theology of Basil of Caesarea: A Synthesis of Greek Thought and Biblical Truth*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007.
- Hill, Charles E. *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hill, Charles E. "Justin and the New Testament Writings." *Studia Patristica* 30 (1997): 42–48.
- Hill, Charles E. "Was John's Gospel among Justin's *Apostolic Memoirs*?" Pages 88–94 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Paul Foster and Sara Parvis. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Hitchcock, F.R.M. *Irenaeus of Lugdunum: A Study of His Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph. *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century*. American Academy of Religion Academy Series 46. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984.
- Holsinger-Friesen, Thomas. *Irenaeus and Genesis: A Study of Competition in Early Christian Hermeneutics*. Journal of Theological Interpretation, Supplements 1. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

- Hughes, Kyle R. "The Lukan Special Material and the Tradition History of the Pericope Adulterae." *Novum Testamentum* 55 (2013): 232–251.
- Hughes, Kyle R. "The Spirit and the Scriptures: Revisiting Cyprian's Use of Prosopological Exegesis." *Journal of Early Christian History* 8 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1080/2222582X.2018.1429941>.
- Hughes, Kyle R. "The Spirit Speaks: Pneumatological Innovation in the Scriptural Exegesis of Justin and Tertullian." *Vigiliae Christianae* 69 (2015): 463–483.
- Huizenga, Leroy A. *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 131. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "Interactive Diversity: A Proposed Model of Christian Origins." *Journal of Theological Studies* 64 (2013): 445–462.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Hvalvik, Reidar. *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/82. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Isaacs, Marie E. *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and Its Bearing on the New Testament*. London: Heythrop College, 1976.
- Janaschke, Hans-Jochen. *Der Heilige Geist im Bekenntnis der Kirche: Eine Studie zur Pneumatologie des Irenäus von Lyon im Ausgang vom altchristlichen Glaubensbekenntnis*. Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 40. Münster: Aschendorff, 1976.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Hebrews: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Johnston, George. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. "The 'Speaking God' and Irenaeus's Interpretative Pattern: The Reception of Genesis." *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 15 (1998): 337–352.
- Keefer, Kyle. *The Branches of the Gospel of John: The Reception of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*. Library of New Testament Studies 332. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Kellum, L. Scott. *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 256. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 3rd ed. London: Black, 1965.
- Kennedy, George A. *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- King, Karen L. *What is Gnosticism?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testa-*

- ment. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
- Koester, Craig R. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 36. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Kominiak, Benedict. *The Theophanies of the Old Testament in the Writings of St. Justin*. Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology 2/14. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.
- Lampe, G.W.H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961–1968.
- Lampe, Peter. *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*. Edited by Marshall D. Johnson. Translated by Michael Steinhauser. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Lashier, Jackson. *Irenaeus on the Trinity*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 127. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Lawson, John. *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus*. London: Epworth, 1948.
- Lee, Aquila H.I. *From Messiah to Pre-existent Son: Jesus' Self-Consciousness and Early Christian Exegesis of Messianic Psalms*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/192. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Leith, John H., ed. *Creeds of the Church: A Reader in Christian Doctrine from the Bible to the Present*. 3rd ed. Louisville: John Knox, 1982.
- Levison, John R. *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 29. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Lewis, Nicola Denzey. *Introduction to "Gnosticism": Ancient Voices, Christian Worlds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Lienhard, Joseph T. "Ousia and Hypostasis: The Cappadocian Settlement and the Theology of 'One Hypostasis.'" Pages 99–121 in *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity*. Edited by Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Lieu, Judith M. *I, II, and III John: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.
- Lieu, Judith M. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Greco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lieu, Judith M. *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Lieu, Judith M. *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel according to Saint John*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Continuum, 2005.
- Litfin, Bryan Mark. "Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*: A Case Study in 'Regular Hermeneutics.'" PhD diss., The University of Virginia, 2002.

- Litwak, Kenneth D. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 282. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Logan, Alastair H.B. *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. "The Holy Spirit in Athenagoras." *Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1969): 538–542.
- Marcus, Joel. *Mark 1–8*. Anchor Bible 27. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Marx-Wolf, Heidi. *Spiritual Taxonomies and Ritual Authority: Platonists, Priests, and Gnostics in the Third Century C.E.* Divinations. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Matlock, R. Barry. *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 127. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- McConnell, James R., Jr. *The topos of Divine Testimony in Luke-Acts*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014.
- McCruden, Kevin B. "Monarchy and Economy in Tertullian's *Adversus Praxeam*." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 55 (2002): 325–337.
- McGowan, Andrew B. "God in Early Latin Theology: Tertullian and the Trinity." Pages 61–81 in *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Memory of Lloyd G. Patterson*. Edited by Andrew B. McGowan, Brian E. Daley, and Timothy J. Gaden. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 94. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- McGowan, Andrew B. "Tertullian and the 'Heretical' Origins of the 'Orthodox' Trinity." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 14 (2006): 437–457.
- McGrath, James F. Review of *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament*, by Matthew W. Bates. *Review of Biblical Literature* (2016).
- Menzies, Robert P. *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 54. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Minns, Denis. *Irenaeus: An Introduction*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul, the Corinthians, and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.

- Moingt, Joseph. *Théologie trinitaire de Tertullien*. 4 vols. Paris: Aubier, 1966–1969.
- Moll, Sebastian. *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 250. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Moll, Sebastian. “Justin and the Pontic Wolf.” Pages 145–151 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Trinity and the Kingdom: The Doctrine of God*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. London: SCM, 1981.
- Montague, George T. *The Holy Spirit: The Growth of a Biblical Tradition*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1976.
- Morgan-Wynne, John Eifion. *Holy Spirit and Religious Experience in Christian Literature ca. AD 90–200*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Mournet, Terence C. *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependence: Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/195. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Munzinger, André. *Discerning the Spirits: Theological and Ethical Hermeneutics in Paul*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Mutschler, Bernhard. *Das Corpus Johanneum bei Irenäus von Lyon: Studien und Kommentar zum dritten Buch von Adversus Haereses*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 189. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Nautin, Pierre. *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens: Des II<sup>e</sup> et III<sup>e</sup> siècles*. Paris: Cerf, 1961.
- Nicklas, Tobias. *Jews and Christians? Second-Century ‘Christian’ Perspectives on the ‘Parting of the Ways’*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Oberdorfer, Bernd. “The Holy Spirit—A Person? Reflection on the Spirit’s Trinitarian Identity.” Pages 27–46 in *The Work of the Spirit: Pneumatology and Pentecostalism*. Edited by Michael Welker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- O’Keefe, John J., and R.R. Reno. *Sanctified Vision: An Introduction to Early Christian Interpretation of the Bible*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- O’Malley, T.P. *Tertullian and the Bible: Language—Imagery—Exegesis*. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1967.
- Orbe, Antonio. *Traducción y Comentario del Libro IV del “Adversus Haereses.”* Vol. 4 of *Teología de San Ireneo*. Biblioteca de Autores Christianos. Madrid: Estudio Teológico de San Ildefonso de Toledo, 1985.
- Osborn, Eric F. *The Emergence of Christian Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Osborn, Eric F. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Osborn, Eric F. *Justin Martyr*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 47. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973.
- Osborn, Eric F. *Tertullian: First Theologian of the West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Systematic Theology*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Papandrea, James L. *Novatian of Rome and the Culmination of Pre-Nicene Orthodoxy*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011.
- Papanikolaou, Aristotle. "Is John Zizioulas an Existentialist in Disguise? Response to Lucian Turcescu." *Modern Theology* 20 (2004): 601–607.
- Parsons, Stuart E. *Ancient Apologetic Exegesis: Introducing and Recovering Theophilus's World*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2015.
- Parvis, Paul. "Who Was Irenaeus? An Introduction to the Man and His Work." Pages 13–24 in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*. Edited by Paul Foster and Sara Parvis. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Parvis, Sara, and Paul Foster, eds. *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)*. Vol. 1 of *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Philip, Finny. *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology: The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Judaism and in the Early Development of Paul's Theology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/194. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Pinnock, Clark. "The Recovery of the Holy Spirit in Evangelical Theology." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13 (2004): 3–18.
- Porsch, Felix. *Pneuma und Wort: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums*. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1974.
- Powell, Douglas. "Tertullianists and Cataphrygians." *Vigiliae Christianae* 29 (1975): 33–54.
- Presley, Stephen O. *The Intertextual Reception of Genesis 1–3 in Irenaeus of Lyons*. The Bible in Ancient Christianity 8. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Presley, Stephen O. "Irenaeus and the Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology." Pages 165–171 in *Irenaeus: Life, Scripture, Legacy*. Edited by Paul Foster and Sara Parvis. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Price, R.M. "'Hellenization' and Logos Doctrine in Justin Martyr." *Vigiliae Christianae* 42 (1988): 18–23.
- Price, Simon. "Latin Christian Apologetics: Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Cyprian." Pages 105–129 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Prigent, Pierre. *Justin et l'Ancien Testament*. Études Bibliques. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1964.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. 3 vols. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1950–1960.

- Rabens, Volker. *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*. 2nd rev. ed. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/283. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Rankin, David. *Tertullian and the Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Rankin, David. "Tertullian's Vocabulary of the Divine 'Individuals' in *adversus Praxean*." *Sacris erudiri* 40 (2001): 5–46.
- Rapp, Claudia. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Rasmus, Tuomas, ed. *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Remus, Harold. "Justin Martyr's Argument with Judaism." Pages 59–80 in *Separation and Polemic*. Vol. 2 of *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Edited by Stephen G. Wilson. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 2. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986.
- Richardson, Peter. *Israel in the Apostolic Church*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Rives, James B. *Religion in the Roman Empire*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.
- Rokéah, David. *Justin Martyr and the Jews*. Jewish and Christian Perspectives 5. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Rondeau, Marie-Josèphe. *Les commentateurs patristiques du Psautier Recherches et bilan, 2: Exégèse prosopologique et théologie*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1985.
- Roth, Dieter T. *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*. New Testament Tools, Studies, and Documents 49. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Rowe, C. Kavin. "Biblical Pressure and Trinitarian Hermeneutics," *Pro Ecclesia* 11 (2002): 295–312.
- Rutherford, Will. "Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci as a Testimony Source for Justin's 'Second God' Argument?" Pages 137–144 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Scott, Alan. "The Date of the *Physiologus*." *Vigiliae Christianae* 52 (1998): 430–441.
- Segal, Alan F. "'Two Powers in Heaven' and Early Christian Trinitarian Thinking." Pages 73–95 in *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity*. Edited by Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall, and Gerald O'Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Segal, Alan F. *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 25. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Sell, Jesse. *The Knowledge of the Truth—Two Doctrines: The Book of Thomas the Contender (CG 11,7) and the False Teachers in the Pastoral Epistles*. European University Studies 23/194. Frankfurt: Lang, 1982.
- Shotwell, W.A. *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*. London: SPCK, 1965.



- Simonetti, Manlio. "Il regresso della teologia dello Spirito santo in Occidente dopo Tertulliano." *Augustinianum* 20 (1980): 655–669.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2002.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. "Justin and His Bible." Pages 53–76 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 56. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Slusser, Michael. "The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology." *Theological Studies* 49 (1988): 461–476.
- Slusser, Michael. "How Much Did Irenaeus Learn from Justin?" *Studia Patristica* 40 (2006): 515–520.
- Slusser, Michael. "Justin Scholarship: Trends and Trajectories." Pages 13–21 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Small, Brian C. *The Characterization of Jesus in the Book of Hebrews*. Biblical Interpretation Series 128. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Stanton, Graham N. "The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr." Pages 321–334 in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen Barton. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Steenberg, M.C. *Irenaeus on Creation: The Cosmic Christ and the Saga of Redemption*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 91. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Stegman, Claire Ann Bradley. "The Development of Tertullian's Doctrine of *Spiritus Sanctus*." PhD diss., Southern Methodist University, 1978.
- Stewart-Sykes, Alistair. "The Original Condemnation of Asian Montanism." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50 (1999): 1–22.
- Stowers, Stanley K. "Apostrophe, Προσωποποιῆς and Paul's Rhetorical Education." Pages 351–369 in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 110. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. "The Hermeneutical Significance of 1 Cor 2:6–16." Pages 328–343 in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Stylianopoulos, Theodore. *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 20. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972.
- Swete, Henry B. *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers*. London: Macmillan, 1912.
- Swete, Henry B. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament: A Study of Primitive Christian Teaching*. London: Macmillan, 1910.

- Tabbernee, William. "Initiation/Baptism in the Montanist Movement." Pages 2:917–945 in *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by David Hellholm, et al. 3 vols. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 176. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Tabbernee, William. *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*. North American Patristic Society Patristic Monograph Series 16. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.
- Tabbernee, William. *Prophets and Gravestones: An Imaginative History of Montanists and Other Early Christians*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles*. New York: Crossroad, 1992.
- Taylor, Miriam S. *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*. Studia Post-biblica 46. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The Holy Spirit—In Biblical Teaching, through the Centuries, and Today*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. "The Holy Spirit in 1 Corinthians: Exegesis and Reception History in the Patristic Era." Pages 207–228 in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen Barton. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Thom, Johan C. "'The Mind Is Its Own Place': Defining the *Topos*." Pages 555–573 in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 110. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Thomassen, Einar. *The Spiritual Seed: The Church of the "Valentinians"*. Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 60. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. *John: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015.
- Towner, Philip H. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Trakatellis, Demetrius C. *The Pre-Existence of Christ in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Trevett, Christine. *Montanism: Gender, Authority, and the New Prophecy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Turcescu, Lucian. "'Person' versus 'Individual', and Other Modern Misreadings of Gregory of Nyssa." *Modern Theology* 18 (2002): 527–539.
- Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Supplements to Journal of Pentecostal Theology 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Villani, Andrea. "Origenes als Schriftsteller: ein Beitrag zu seiner Verwendung von Prosopopöie, mit einigen Beobachtungen über die prosopologische Exegese." *Adamantius* 14 (2008): 130–150.

- Wainwright, Arthur W. *The Trinity in the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 1962.
- Wallace, Daniel B. "Greek Grammar and the Personality of the Holy Spirit." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 13 (2003): 97–125.
- Waszink, J.H. "Tertullian's Principles and Methods of Exegesis." Pages 17–31 in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant*. Edited by William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken. Théologie historique 53. Paris: Beauchesne, 1979.
- Wendel, Susan. "Interpreting the Descent of the Spirit: A Comparison of Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* and Luke-Acts." Pages 95–103 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Werline, Rodney. "The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*." *Harvard Theological Review* 92 (1999): 79–93.
- Wiles, Maurice. "The Theological Legacy of St Cyprian." Pages 66–80 in *Working Papers in Doctrine*. London: SCM, 1976.
- Wilhite, David E. "The Spirit of Prophecy: Tertullian's Pauline Pneumatology." Pages 45–71 in *Tertullian and Paul*. Edited by Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite. Vol. 1 of *Pauline and Patristic Scholars in Debate*. New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- Wilhite, David E. *Tertullian the African: An Anthropological Reading of Tertullian's Context and Identities*. Millennium-Studien 14. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007.
- Wilken, Robert L. *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Williams, M.A. *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Yeago, David S. "The New Testament and the Nicene Dogma: A Contribution to the Recovery of Theological Exegesis." *Pro Ecclesia* 3 (1994): 152–164.
- Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Young, Frances M. "Greek Apologists of the Second Century." Pages 81–104 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Zañartu, Sergio. "Notas sobre el pensamiento trinitario de Tertuliano en *Adversus Praxean*." *Teología y vida* 55 (2014): 405–434.
- Zilling, Heinrike Maria. *Tertullian: Untertan Gottes und der Kaisers*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004.
- Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

# Index of Ancient Sources

## Old Testament

<b>Genesis</b>		2:8	51, 122–123, 169–170, 180
1:1–3	57	3:1	159–160, 173, 175–176
1:2	127n85	3:4	175–176
1:3	180	3:5	51–54, 125–126
1:11–24	177–178	4:6	177, 180
1:26	51, 123–124, 128, 168–172	8:4	57
1:26–28	50	8:6	177, 180
2:16	127	19:2–5	55, 57
3:14	57	19:5–6	179
3:22	170	21:4	127
9:24–27	57	22:1–23	53, 66n118, 125n83
18	39	22:2	175–176
18–19	39, 67, 71, 75	22:7–8	51–52
19:23–25	33–34	22:9–10	174, 176
19:24	39, 41–42, 44–45, 53n78, 56, 58–59, 66, 67n119, 71–72, 76, 95, 103, 114–117, 127, 130, 165, 207	22:16	51, 57
49:8–12	56	22:18	51, 57
49:10	49–50, 122n72	22:21	174, 176
49:10–11	57	22:22	174, 176
49:11	56	22:25	174, 176
<b>Exodus</b>		23:5	198
3:8	117–118	24	56, 59–60, 62n98, 68
3:14	117	24:8	132n102
33:20	174–175	24:10	60, 68
<b>Numbers</b>		31:5	175–176
12:7	127–128	33:6	176n67
<b>Deuteronomy</b>		41:1	196n133
32:22	57	45	43
33:13–17	49–50, 122n72	45:1	158, 168–171
<b>Psalms</b>		45:6–7	19n67, 33–34, 39–40, 42–45, 56, 93, 103, 114–116, 127, 165, 171n59, 207
1:1	127	45:7	53n78, 66
2:7	12–13, 20, 51, 107, 125–126, 158, 169–172	47	62n98
2:7–8	50–51, 107, 121, 123, 125, 164n49, 168–169, 171	47:5–9	62
		50:1	104, 116, 127, 207
		50:3	104, 116, 127, 207
		59:11	174, 176
		68:26	174, 176
		71:18	159–160, 173, 175–176
		72	56
		72:17	49–50, 122n72
		82	57, 117n60

82:1	104, 115-117, 127, 207	5:12	127
82:6	104, 116-117	7:10-17	56, 127-128
91:13	169, 171	7:14	57
95:4-7	127-128	8:4	56
95:7-11	92	8:14	169, 171
96	56	9:2	180
96:1-2	57	27:1	57
96:4-10	57	28:16	169, 171
96:5	56	41:4	175
96:10	55	42:1	158-159, 167, 170-171
99	56, 62	42:1-4	49-50, 159n34
99:8-9	62	42:2-3	169, 171
110	13-14, 42, 56, 68, 108n28	42:3	122n72
110:1	13, 14n52, 33-34, 39- 40, 42-45, 56, 60, 66, 102-103, 107, 112-116, 121-123, 125-127, 155- 156, 157n30, 163-166, 169-170, 176-177, 180, 207, 212	42:5-13	50-51
110:1-4	170-171	42:6	169
110:3	13, 49, 170	42:6-7	50, 168-169, 171
110:3-4	50, 122n72	43:10	118-120
110:4	49-50	43:10-12	120n69
148:5-6	127	44:24	175
		44:25-26	170-171
		45:1	107, 123, 155, 163-165, 166n52, 168, 171, 176-
			177, 207
		49:5	108n30, 125-126
		49:5-6	107-108, 125, 159
		49:6	50-51, 121-123, 158- 159, 167, 169-171, 179-180
<b>Proverbs</b>			
8:21-25	53	49:8	50-51
8:21-36	53-54	49:18	177, 179
8:22	174-175	50:4	175
8:22-25	127, 175	50:6-8	51, 53-54
8:22-31	54n79, 127, 128n85,	50:7	52
	176	50:10	169, 172
8:24	174	51:4-5	49-50, 122n72
8:27	175	52:14	169, 171
8:27-28	174	53:1	57, 165n50, 176
8:27-30	175	53:1-2	156, 163-165, 166n52,
8:27-31	127, 174		177, 180
16:6	196	53:2-3	60
		53:5	56
<b>Isaiah</b>		53:7	57
1:3	57	53:8	56
1:3-4	47	53:8-12	57
1:11-15	47	55:4	169, 171
1:14	177-178	55:5	169, 171
1:16-20	49n71	57:1	122n72
2:2	169, 171	57:1-2	57, 122n72
2:3-4	54, 57	57:1-4	49-50

**Isaiah** (*cont.*)

58:2	57
58:6–7	47
60:8	177–178
61:1	125–126, 159–160, 173, 175
61:10	174–175, 179
62:10–63:6	49–50, 122n72
63:2	198
63:15–64:12	56
65:1	104, 116
65:2	51, 57
66:1	47

**Jeremiah**

1:9	175
31:15	56
31:31–32	50
31:33–34	92

**Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha****Ascension of Isaiah**

9:36	8n21
------	------

**Lamentations**

4:20	30n5, 177, 181
------	----------------

**Ezekiel**

16:3	56
------	----

**Daniel**

7	31n13
---	-------

**Joel**

2:28	168–172
2:28–29	169

**Zechariah**

9:9	56
-----	----

**Malachi**

1:10–11	177–178
---------	---------

**New Testament****Matthew**

11:25	132
22:43–44	66nn19
24:28	136
27:39–43	51

**Mark**

1:10	44, 178
1:10–11	12
12:35–37	66nn19
12:36	43n60

**Luke**

2:22–24	129
5:27–39	179
5:34–35	179
9:35	172
10:21	132
20:42	43n60
20:42–43	67nn19

**John**

1:1	179n73
1:1–2	140n133
1:3	176n67
1:32–33	85n185
3:13	118
5:37	118–119
13:31–32	136nn18
13:31–16:33	81
14:6	83
14:15–17	81n70
14:16–17	200m153
14:26	81n170, 147
15:4–10	136nn18
15:26	200m153
15:26–27	81–83, 84n184, 86, 92, 94, 96
15:27	83
16:7	200m153
16:7–11	81n170

16:12–13	83	3:17–18	96n219
16:12–14	81n170	4:4	180
16:13	139, 151n9, 187, 200n153	4:6	179–180
17:4–5	136n118	5:5	3n7
17:20–23	141n137	<b>Galatians</b>	
17:21	118	4:6	162n44
17:26	118–119	<b>Ephesians</b>	
18:37	82	1:10	134n107
19:30	85n185	1:18	180
19:34–35	85n185	1:20–22	180n79
20:28	41n54, 115n58	3:9	134n107
<b>Acts</b>		<b>Philippians</b>	
1:1	10n34	1:19	162n44
2:32–36	67n119	<b>1 Thessalonians</b>	
2:34	43n60	4:8	3n7
7:55–56	17	4:17	178
<b>Romans</b>		<b>1 Timothy</b>	
5:5	3n7	2:4	139
8:9–11	162n44	2:5–6	139
8:15	104, 116–117	<b>2 Timothy</b>	
10:16	165n50	2:25	139n129
10:20	104, 116	3:7	139n129
<b>1 Corinthians</b>		<b>Titus</b>	
1:18–31	88	1:1	139n129
2:6–9	89	<b>Hebrews</b>	
2:6–16	88	1:5–13	43
2:10	89	1:8–9	19n67, 43n62, 93–94, 171n59
2:10–12	78, 87, 89–90, 94, 96	1:13	67n119
2:10–14	89	1:14	91n212
2:11	89, 191n113, 200	3:7–11	91–94, 96
2:11–12	91n207	9:6–10	91n212
2:12	90	10:15–17	91–94
2:15	137	10:26	139n129
5:3	141n137	<b>1 Peter</b>	
7:1	87n193	3:22	180n79
8:6	88n196	<b>1 John</b>	
12:1	87	5:4–5	84
12:2	87	5:4–12	84
12:3	87–88, 90, 94		
15:25–27	180n79		
<b>2 Corinthians</b>			
1:22	3n7		
3:14–17	91n212		
3:17	162n44		

**1John (cont.)**

5:6	84n184, 139
5:6–9	81, 84, 86, 94, 96

5:8	85n185
5:9–12	85n188

**Rabbinic Texts****Talmud**

b.Sanh. 38b	71
-------------	----

**Early Christian Writings****Aristides***Apologia*

15.1	95n217
------	--------

**Athanasius***De decretis*

26	202n157
----	---------

*Epistulae ad Serapionem*

1.28	5n11
1.31	96

**Athenagoras***Legatio pro Christianis*

6.3	8n21
10.4	184n86
24.1	184n86

**Augustine***De Trinitate*

5.8.9	204
-------	-----

**Basil of Caesarea***De Spiritu Sancto*

18.46	90n206, 97n220
21.52	96

**Ps.-Basil of Caesarea***Contra Eunomium*

5	97n219
---	--------

**Clement of Rome***1 Clement*

13.1	95n217
16.2	95n217
22.1	95n217
36.4	43n60

**Cyprian***Ad Demetrianum*

17	197n138
20	197n138, 197n139

*Ad Fortunatum*

10	197n138, 197n139
12	197n138

*De bono patientiae*

22	97n138
----	--------

*De catholicae ecclesiae unitate*

4	197n138
8	197n138
10	197n138
16	197n138
24	197n138

*De dominica oratione*

5	197n138
35	197n139

*De habitu virginum*

1	197n138
13	197n138

*De lapsis*

10	197n138
27	197n138

*De mortalitate*

11	197n138
23	197n138

*De opere et eleemosynis*

2	196–197
4	197n136
5	196n133, 197n136
9	196n134

*De zelo et livore*

8	197n138
---	---------



*Epistulae*

3.2	197n138
4.1	197n138
10.2	197n138
59.5	197n138
59.20	197n138
63	197–198
63.4	198n142
63.5	197n138
63.7	198
63.11	198
67.9	197n138
69.2	197n138
69.5	197n138
70.2	197n138
73.6	197n138
74.5	195n129
75.7	201n155
75.8–9	195n129
76.4	197n139

*Epistle of Barnabas*

12.10	43n60, 67n119
12.11	164n49

**Eusebius***Historia ecclesiastica*

2.2	149n1
5.3.4	138n125

**Gregory of Nazianzus***Orationes*

21.35	6n14
23.12	96n218
31.3	147n149
31.26	6n15
31.27	147n150
39.11	6n14

**Hippolytus***Contra Noetum*

11	184n86
14	185n91

*Refutatio omnium haeresium*

5.26.15–17	68
5.26.16–18	43n60
9.7–10	150n3

**Ignatius of Antioch***To the Ephesians*

18.2	134n107
20.1	134n107

*To the Philadelphians*

7.2	95n217
-----	--------

**Irenaeus***Adversus haereses*

1.2.1–5	111n41
1.2.5	142n139
1.4.1–2	111n41
1.7.3	105n20
1.8.1	109n33
1.8.2	134n104
1.10.1	109n34, 135n112, 183n84
1.10.3	134n104
1.11.1	99n3, 141n138
1.12.4	142n139
1.28.1	99n2
1.29.4	99n3
1.30.1	99n3
2.12.7	142n141
2.19.9	142n141
2.28.2	126n84
2.28.7	123
2.34.3	108n29, 127
3.1–4	109n35, 131n97
3.3–5	112
3.4.2	183n84
3.6–15	112
3.6.1	13n49, 28, 102–105, 110, 112–118, 120–121, 122n74, 125n82, 126– 131, 171n59, 206n1, 207
3.6.1–4	112
3.6.2	117–120, 125n82, 132
3.6.2–5	105
3.6.3	117
3.6.4	117
3.6.5	112n47, 127
3.7.2	108n29, 126n84
3.9.1	113n49, 131–132
3.9.3	125n82
3.10.1	113n49
3.10.3	128
3.10.4	127

*Adversus haereses (cont.)*

3.10.5	113n49, 129–130
3.10.6	110n38, 122n71
3.11.9	139n127
3.12.1	122n71
3.15.3	112n44
3.16.1	112n44
3.16.2	108n29, 126n84
3.17.1	125n82
3.17.2–3	139n127
3.18.3	126, 160n35
3.19.1	125n82
3.19.2	129–130
3.21.4	127–128
3.21.7	122n71
3.24.1	139n127
4.pref.4	123, 172n60
4.1.1	114n52
4.2.2	119n66, 132
4.2.4	127
4.5.1	120n69
4.6.2	99n2
4.8.1	108n29, 126n84
4.9.3	132n101
4.10.2	122n72
4.11.1	108n29, 126n84
4.12.4	125n82
4.14.1	122n71, 136, 141
4.14.2	135n109
4.20.1	123, 124n79, 172n60
4.20.3	127, 176n65
4.20.3–4	8n21
4.20.5–8	108n29
4.20.8	125n83, 126n84, 141n135
4.20.9	125n82
4.21.3	123
4.29.2	125n82
4.33.1	108n29, 126n84, 137n124, 143n145, 144
4.33.1–7	138n125
4.33.6	138n125
4.33.7	137–140, 142n142, 183n84, 187n97
4.33.7–9	138n125
4.33.10–15	138n125
4.33.12	125n83
4.33.15	137n124, 140n133
4.34–35	143n143

4.34.4	122n72, 125n82
4.35.2	139n127, 142–143
4.36.5	125n82
4.36.6	119n66
4.38.4	136n119
5.1.1	136n119
5.1.3	123, 172n60
5.6.1	8n21
5.12.2	122n71
5.15.3	125n82
5.15.4	123, 125n82, 172n60
5.20.2	127
5.24.1	125n82
5.25.2	113n49, 129–130
5.26.2	99n2
5.31.1	125n82
5.34.3	126n84

*Epideixis tou apostolikou kerygmatos*

2	125n82, 127
5	8n21
5–8	141n136
6	183n84
8	127–128
9	125n82
24	128n86
26	108n29, 126n84
30	126n84
34	125n82
43	122n71
45	125n82
46	125n82
48	108n28, 122n71, 122n72
49	123, 126, 164n49, 165n50
49–50	106–109, 121, 125–126, 159n34
50	123, 126, 167n55
53	126, 160n35
55	123, 172n60
62	122n71
67	108n29, 126n84
68	122n71, 125n82
72	122n72
73	126
79	125n82
79–80	125n83
80	125n82
82	125n82

84	60n97, 132n102	58.1	74n145
85	122n71	59	57
92	125n82	59-60	58n87
		60.6-7	30n6
<b>Jerome</b>		60.8-9	57
<i>De viris illustribus</i>		61.3	30n7
53	149n1, 195n127	61.13	30n4, 37n37
70	199n146	62-63	39n44
		62.3	53n78
<b>Justin Martyr</b>		63.2	57, 58n87
<i>Apologia I</i>		63.12	57, 58n87
6.2	30n8	65.3	30n7
26.5	74n145	67.2	30n7
32.1-2	55n86, 57	<i>Apologia II</i>	
33.1-2	57	10.8	30n5
33.6	30n5	<i>Dialogus cum Tryphone</i>	
33.9	30n5	2.6	77
35.3	57	3-8	77, 79
36	36, 46, 62n98, 66	3.7	77
36-45	36, 65, 108-109	4.1-2	77
36.1	30n5, 47n69	7.1	37n37, 78
36.1-2	36-37, 54n81, 108	7.2	63n103
36.3	37n36	7.2-3	38n38
37	46-49, 51, 66, 159n34	7.3	77
37-45	46, 49n71, 54	11.3	50
37.9	48	12.1	49n71
38	46, 51	13.2-9	49n71
38.1	37n37, 52n78	14.4-7	49n71
38.2-5	53	16.1	48n71
38.4	52n78	16.5	50
39	54	18.2	48n71
39-45	46, 58, 126	19.2	48n71
39.1	54, 57, 196n135	19.4	50
40	55n83	19.6	48n71
40.1-4	57	20.4	48n71
40.5-19	57	21	48n71
41-43	55n85	24.3	52n78
41.1-4	57	25.1-5	56, 58n87
44.1	37n37	26.2	50
44.2-4	49n71	26.3-4	50
44.8-10	38n38	27.4	48n71
45.2-4	42n56, 49n71	28.3-6	48n71
47.1	37n37, 52n77	30.3	134n107
48.4-6	57	31.1	134n107
49.1-4	52n78	32.3	42n56, 56, 129n89
50.3-4	49n71	32.5	48n71
51.1-5	57	32.6	42n56, 49n71, 56
53.2	63n103	33.2	42n56, 50, 56, 129n89
53.6	37n37	34.1	56

<i>Dialogus cum Tryphone (cont.)</i>		56.16	74n143
34.3-6	56	56.22-23	39
35.6	74n145, 78n164	57.2	53n78
36	27, 59	58.4-8	53n78
36.1	47n69, 59	61-62	39n44
36.2	56, 59, 61, 129n89	61.2	184n86
36.3-4	56, 59	61.3-5	53
36.5	60n95, 68	62.1	50
36.6	19, 56, 60-61, 68,	63.3	42n56, 50
	132n102	63.4	43n62
37	46-47, 61	65.4-7	50
37-38	39n44	73.3-5	56
37.2	56, 62, 129n89	74.2	56
37.3-4	56	75	39n44
37.4	62	77.4	56
41.2	48n71	78.8	56
42.2	165n50	80-82	78n165
43.3	56	82.3-4	48n71
43.4	56	83	42n56
43.5-6	56	83.2	42, 49n71
44.2	48n71	84.1	57
45.4	134n107	85.1	115n57
49.2	53n78	86	39n44
52.1-2	56	86.3	53n78
52.4	53n78	87.5	134n107, 151n9
53.3	56	87.6	49n71
53.4	56	88.1	73n141
54.1	56	88.8	44n67, 53n78
55.1	33, 129n89	91.1	50
55.2	56, 62n101	91.4	57
56	27, 29, 39, 69, 71-73,	97-107	66n118
	75-76, 78-79, 93, 96,	98	53
	105, 113n50, 115	98.2-5	53
56-60	39, 66, 67n120,	99.1	53
	72n138, 75	103.3	134n107
56-62	39	107.3-4	48n71
56.3	129n89	113-114	39n44
56.4	74n143, 75n148	113.2	40n50
56.11	39n43	114.2	57, 165n50
56.12	39, 56	114.3	57
56.14	34n21, 41, 42n56,	117.1	49n71
	53n78, 56, 61, 108,	118.2	49n71
	113-115, 129n89, 130,	119.4	49n71
	171n59, 196n135, 207	119.6	50
56.14-15	13n49, 19, 33-34, 38-	120.1	49n71, 134n107
	46, 49n74, 54, 58, 61,	120.3	50
	67-69, 78-79, 93-96,	121.1	50
	103, 115, 118, 206n1	121.4	50, 159n34, 167n55
56.15	40-41, 46n68, 129n89	122.1	52n78, 120

- |         |                    |  |  |
|---------|--------------------|--|--|
| 122.3   | 49n71              |  |  |
| 122.5   | 50                 |  |  |
| 122.6   | 50                 |  |  |
| 123.3–6 | 49n71              |  |  |
| 123.8   | 50, 159n34, 167n55 |  |  |
| 124.1   | 57                 |  |  |
| 124.2–4 | 57                 |  |  |
| 124.4   | 42n56, 129n89      |  |  |
| 125–129 | 39n44              |  |  |
| 127.5   | 42n56              |  |  |
| 128.3   | 184n86             |  |  |
| 129.1   | 53n78              |  |  |
| 129.2   | 53                 |  |  |
| 129.3   | 53                 |  |  |
| 133.2–3 | 49n71              |  |  |
| 135.2   | 49n71              |  |  |
| 136.2   | 52n78              |  |  |
| 139.1   | 57                 |  |  |
| 139.3   | 57                 |  |  |
- Lactantius**  
*Divinarum institutionum*  
 4.13 202n157  
 4.29 202n157
- Methodius of Olympus**  
*Symposium*  
 8.11 213n2
- Nag Hammadi Codices**  
*Exegesis of the Soul*  
 NHC I,6: 129.5 105n20  
*Prayer of the Apostle Paul*  
 NHC I,1: A.17 139n127  
*Tripartite Tractate*  
 NHC I,5: 95.8 135n108
- Novatian**  
*De Trinitate*  
 1.1 199n147  
 16.2–3 200n150  
 29 199n149  
 29.9 200n152
- Origen**  
*Commentarii in evangelium Joannis*  
 1.90–124 179n73  
 2.75 8n23  
 2.87 8n21  
 6.288 68n125
- Commentarii in Romanos*  
 2.11.2–3 213n2  
*Expositio in Proverbia*  
 22.28 96n218  
*De principiis (Peri archōn)*  
 1.2.9 8n24  
 1.3.4 191n113, 213n2  
 1.3.5 8n23  
 2.7.3 202n158  
 2.7.3–4 213n2  
 2.7.4 189n104  
*Philocalia*  
 7 213n2
- Tatian**  
*Oratio ad Graecos*  
 5.4 184n86
- Tertullian**  
*Adversus Hermogenem*  
 3 164n48  
 18.1 174  
 18.3 168, 176n67  
 20.1 174  
 20.4 176n67  
 22.1 177  
 32.2 174, 176n67  
*Adversus Iudaeos*  
 5.4 177  
 7.2 168  
 9.23 173n64, 177n68,  
 178n69  
 10.4 173n64  
 10.13 174  
 10.19 177n68  
 12 168  
 13.15 151n9  
 13.27 174  
 14.12 168  
*Adversus Marcionem*  
 1.29.4 151n9  
 2.4.1 169  
 2.27.3–5 173n64  
 2.27.5 174  
 3.2.1 173n63  
 3.5.2 173n64  
 3.6.6 173n63  
 3.6.7 173n64  
 3.16.5 162n44, 173n64  
 3.17.1 169

*Adversus Marcionem (cont.)*

3.19.5	173n64, 174	7.2	170, 173n63
3.20.3-5	169	8	202n157
3.20.5	169	8.4-7	191n113
3.22.6	174	8.5	153n17, 184, 188
3.23.4	174	8.7	184, 191n114
3.24.11	177-179	11	13, 28, 149, 155, 157- 158, 160, 161n39, 162n43, 163-167, 171, 180, 187, 195-196, 202n157
4.11.7	174, 177, 179	11.2	179
4.12.4	178n69	11.3	170, 173n63
4.13.1	173n64	11.4	158
4.13.2	175	11.5	170-171, 179
4.14.1	169	11.5-7	158-159
4.14.13	175	11.6	173, 175
4.22.8	169, 172	11.7	173, 207
4.22.12	161n39, 178n69	11.7-8	155-157, 162-163, 166, 176-179, 181, 197-198, 200, 206n1
4.23.8	169	11.8	165, 177, 180-181, 207
4.24.10	169	11.9	166n53
4.25.5	169	11.9-10	160
4.25.9	169	11.10	122n73, 167-168, 171, 173, 175
4.28.10	162n44	12.1-2	170
4.33.9	162n44	13	165
4.39.7	175	14	181
4.39.11	169	14.3	184n86
4.40.6	177n68	14.6	162n44
4.41.4	169	14.10	177-178, 181
4.42.6	175	19.2	175, 176n67, 191n113
5.2	169	19.4	170
5.4	169	19.5-6	175
5.5	169	22.5	175
5.6	169	23.9	175
5.7	177n68	26.4	186n93
5.8	151n9, 162n44, 169	30.5	8n23, 153n17, 185n91, 188-189
5.9	170	<i>Adversus Valentinianos</i>	
5.11	170, 177, 179-180	5.1	149n2
5.17	170, 177, 180-181	<i>Ad uxorem</i>	
<i>Adversus Praxean</i>		2.2.4	177n68
1.5	151n7, 193	<i>Apologeticus</i>	
2.1	151n9, 153n17, 190n110, 191n112	20.4	177n68
2.1-2	183, 186-189	21.12-14	184n86
2.4	8n23, 162n42, 185n91	23.12	162n44
3	192n119		
3.1	192-193		
3.2	150n3		
3.2-5	185n88		
4.2	170		
6-7	8n24		
6.1-2	175, 176n67		
7.1	170, 175, 176n67		

*De anima*

9.4 151n7  
11.4 177n68  
58.8 151n7

*De carne Christi*

20.4–5 174  
23.6 177n68

*De corona militis*

4.6 187n98

*De cultu feminarum*

2.2.5 177n68

*De exhortatione castitatis*

10.5 188n102

*De idololatria*

4.5 177n68  
14.6 177, 178n69  
15.6 177n68

*De jejunio adversus psychicos*

1.3 151n9  
15.1 177n68

*De monogamia*

2 151n9  
2–3 151n7, 151n8

*De oratione*

2.3 177n68  
20.2 177n68  
22.1 177n68

*De patientia*

7.5 177n68

*De praescriptione haereticorum*

6.6 177n68  
13.1–6 182n82  
22.9 187n98  
28.1 187n98

*De pudicitia*

21 151n9  
21.7 188n102

*De resurrectione carnis*

6.4 168  
10.2 168  
11.2 151n7, 188n102  
24.8 177n68  
37.7 162n44  
63.9 151n8

*De virginibus velandis*

1.3 182n82  
1.4–7 151n9  
4.3 177n68

**Theophilus**

*Ad Autolycum*

1.7.3 8n21  
2.10.2 171n59

**Greco-Roman Literature**

**Cicero**

*Topica*

4.24 10n33

**Quintilian**

*Institutio oratoria*

9.2.29–37 35

# Index of Modern Authors

- Abasciano, Brian J. 23n78
- Albl, Martin C. 42n59, 43n63, 63n102, 63n103, 64n106, 64n108, 64n109, 65n111, 157n30
- Allert, Craig D. 29n1, 38n38, 48n70, 71n133, 73n139, 77n158, 78n161, 86n190
- Allison, Dale C. 23n78
- Allison, Gregg R. 7n16
- Anatolios, Khaled 3n5, 5n13
- Andresen, Carl 13–16, 18–19, 36n30, 37n35, 40n48, 155, 157n29, 157n30, 158, 160, 162n45
- Attridge, Harold W. 92n213, 92n214
- Aune, David E. 71n133
- Ayres, Lewis 2n5, 5n9, 5n10, 5n13, 7–9, 97, 100, 106, 147, 151–152, 174n64, 194n125, 204, 210–211
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von 161n41, 162n43
- Barnard, L.W. 29n1, 30n3, 30n5, 31, 32n18, 38n38, 64n104, 71n133, 72n137, 77n155, 86n190
- Barnes, Michel René 7–9, 97, 100, 101n12, 106, 147–148, 151–152, 174n64, 176, 185, 194n125, 204, 210–211
- Barnes, Timothy David 149n1, 152, 168n57
- Barrett, C.K. 3n6, 88n197
- Bates, Matthew W. 12n44, 12n45, 13n46, 17–21, 35n25, 36, 37n35, 38, 40n48, 42, 43n60, 59n90, 93, 106, 110n35, 110n36, 135n110, 157n29, 157n30, 162, 196, 204n161, 212
- Bauer, Walter 24n81
- Beeley, Christopher A. 147n150
- Behr, John 98n1, 106n25, 110n35, 134n108, 135n111, 135n112, 136n115, 137n121, 137n122, 150n3
- Bekken, Per Jarle 82n171
- Bennema, Cornelis 141n137
- Bergian, Silke-Petra 25n84
- Bethune-Baker, J.F. 6n16, 161n41
- Blackman, E.C. 74n145, 75n150, 76n151
- Blackwell, Ben C. 117n60
- Blowers, Paul M. 109n34, 110n35, 111n39, 124, 127n85, 128n87, 135–136, 182n82
- Bockmuehl, Markus 89n204
- Boyarín, Daniel 24n82, 26n85, 69–70, 73
- Brakke, David 98n1, 99n3
- Brawley, Robert L. 23n79
- Bray, Gerald 149n1
- Breck, John 4n7, 81n167, 83n176, 83n177
- Brent, Allen 184n86, 195n126
- Briggman, Anthony 7n19, 9n30, 11n40, 19, 29–33, 34n22, 38n40, 41, 46, 87–88, 100–102, 109n32, 109n34, 123n76, 134n104, 135n111, 136n117, 137n121, 140n131, 140n133, 147
- Brown, Raymond E. 4n7, 81n168, 81n169, 84n182, 119n64, 119n68
- Brown, Tricia Gates 81n167, 82n174, 83n175, 83n176, 83n177, 83n178, 83n179, 85n185, 85n186
- Brunt, John C. 9n31
- Bucur, Bogdan G. 7n20, 32n15, 32n16, 67, 71n133
- Burge, Gary M. 81n167, 82n171, 82n174, 83n175, 83n178, 83n180, 85n185
- Burgess, Stanley M. 6n16, 154
- Burns, J. Patout, Jr. 149n1, 195n126
- Castelo, Daniel 1n2, 3n7
- Chadwick, Henry 29n1, 64n104
- Collins, Paul M. 6n14
- Collins, Raymond F. 87n193, 88n195, 88n199, 89n203, 90n205
- Cosgrove, Charles H. 74n144, 86n190
- Daley, Brian E. 6n14
- Daniélou, Jean 3n6, 8n25, 60n97, 67n119, 68
- Decret, François 149n1
- DelCogliano, Mark 7n19
- DeSimone, Russell J. 199n144, 199n146, 199n147, 200n151, 201n154
- Desjardins, Michel R. 99n3
- De Wet, Chris L. 97n219
- Dodd, C.H. 81n167
- Donovan, Mary Ann 98n1, 100n6, 112n44, 112n46, 115n58, 117n60, 117n61, 129n90, 129n92, 129n94, 137n123, 138n125, 143n143
- Downs, David J. 195–197
- Droge, Arthur J. 77n155



- Dunn, Geoffrey D. 149n1, 192n118, 199n147, 200n151, 201n154
- Dunn, James D.G. 3n6, 4n7, 23n78, 162n44, 172n62
- Edwards, Mark J. 18n64, 25n84, 33n18, 77n155
- Emmrich, Martin 9n211
- Enslin, Morton S. 98n1
- Evans, Ernest 13n50, 149n2, 150n3, 155, 161n40, 162n43, 167n55, 171n59, 172n61, 174n64, 180n77, 181n80, 186n93
- Evans, Robert F. 153n17, 189n105
- Fahey, Michael Andrew 195n128
- Fantino, Jacques 134n106, 135n111, 135n112, 136n117, 137n120
- Fay, Ron C. 4n8
- Fee, Gordon D. 3n6, 4n7, 87n191, 88n197, 88n198, 89n202, 90n205
- Ferguson, Everett 100n6, 182n82
- Foster, Paul 65n113, 91n207, 98n1
- Fredouille, Jean-Claude 168n57
- Freund, Richard A. 70n132
- Gabriel, Andrew K. 4n8
- Goodenough, Erwin R. 30n3, 30n5, 31, 32n18, 37n35, 38n38
- Goodman, Martin 25n84
- Grant, Robert M. 26n85, 98n1, 99n3, 109n34, 134n104, 138n125
- Green, Joel B. 24n79
- Gregory, Andrew F. 24n80, 86n190, 91n208
- Harnack, Adolf 6n16, 74n145, 99–100, 153–154, 199n146
- Harvey, A.E. 82n172
- Hay, David M. 14n52, 42n59, 43n60, 66n119
- Haykin, Michael A.G. 5n10, 5n12, 97n219, 195n129, 198n143
- Hays, Richard B. 23
- Heine, Ronald E. 138n125, 150n4
- Henne, Philippe 149n1
- Hildebrand, Stephen M. 5n12, 90n206
- Hill, Charles E. 86
- Hitchcock, F.R.M. 98n1, 138n125
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph 74n145
- Holsinger-Friesen, Thomas 123n75, 137n121
- Horn, F.W. 32
- Hughes, Kyle R. 58n89, 85n189, 166n52, 195n130
- Huizenga, Leroy A. 23n78
- Hurtado, Larry W. 7n17, 31n13
- Hvalvik, Reidar 70n130
- Isaacs, Marie E. 3n6
- Jaschke, Hans-Jochen 100n8, 108n29
- Jensen, Robin M. 149n1
- Johnson, Luke Timothy 92n213, 92n214
- Johnston, George 81n167
- Kannengiesser, Charles 109n31
- Keefer, Kyle 139n128
- Keener, Craig S. 81n168, 81n169, 82n174, 83n175, 83n176, 83n177, 119n64, 119n68
- Kellum, L. Scott 81n168
- Kelly, J.N.D. 3n5, 26n86, 150n3, 154n19, 182n81, 183n85
- Kennedy, George A. 23n77, 35n26
- King, Karen L. 99n3, 111n40, 111n41
- Koester, Craig R. 92n213, 92n214
- Kominiak, Benedict 39n44, 39n45, 66
- Lampe, Peter 74n145, 77n155, 78n162
- Lashier, Jackson 7n19, 111n40, 98n1, 98n2, 100n5, 101–102, 111n41, 120n70, 142n139
- Lawson, John 123n76
- Lee, Aquila H.I. 180n79
- Leith, John H. 1n1, 5n13
- Levison, John R. 3n6
- Lewis, Nicola Denzey 99n3, 111n41
- Lienhard, Joseph T. 6n14
- Lieu, Judith M. 24n82, 69n127, 70n130, 74n145, 75n146, 75n147, 76n153, 84n184, 85n185, 85n187, 85n188
- Lincoln, Andrew T. 82n174
- Litfin, Bryan Mark 171n58, 182n82
- Litwak, Kenneth D. 23n78, 24n79
- Logan, Alastair H.B. 99n3
- Malherbe, Abraham J. 128n85, 184n86
- Marcus, Joel 12n41, 12n43
- Marx-Wolf, Heidi 24–25, 111n43, 133n102, 133n103, 144
- Matlock, R. Barry 89n203
- McConnell, James R., Jr. 9–12, 44–45

- McCruden, Kevin B. 152n11, 185n88, 185n89,  
186n92, 189n107, 190, 193n123  
 McGowan, Andrew B. 152n11, 152n12, 154,  
183n85, 184n86, 185n89, 185n90, 187–  
188, 190–193  
 McGrath, James F. 18n65  
 Menzies, Robert P. 3n6  
 Metzger, Bruce M. 85n189  
 Michel, Otto 132n99, 132n101, 134n106  
 Minns, Denis 29n1, 30n5, 37, 52n77, 55n85,  
98n1  
 Mitchell, Margaret M. 23n77, 87n193,  
88n196, 88n199  
 Moingt, Joseph 15n57, 162n42  
 Moll, Sebastian 74n144, 74n145  
 Moltmann, Jürgen 4n8  
 Montague, George T. 3n6  
 Morgan-Wynne, John Eifion 7n16  
 Mournet, Terence C. 23n78  
 Munzinger, André 89n204  
 Mutschler, Bernhard 112n45, 114n53, 118n63  
  
 Nautin, Pierre 98n1  
 Nicklas, Tobias 70n130  
  
 Oberdorfer, Bernd 2n4  
 O'Keefe, John J. 110n35, 179n73  
 O'Malley, T.P. 15n18, 153n17  
 Orbe, Antonio 140n134  
 Osborn, Eric F. 29n1, 30n3, 30n5, 37n35,  
48n70, 58n88, 64n104, 71n133, 77n155,  
77n158, 91n209, 98n1, 134n105, 134n106,  
135n111, 135n112, 137n120, 138n125, 140,  
152n11, 161, 162n42, 162n43, 185n88,  
185n89, 185n90, 186n93, 186n94,  
186n95  
  
 Pannenberg, Wolfhart 4n8  
 Papandrea, James L. 199n144, 199n145,  
199n146, 199n147, 199n148, 200n151,  
201n154  
 Papanikolaou, Aristotle 6n14  
 Parsons, Stuart E. 25n84  
 Parvis, Paul 29n1, 30n5, 37, 52n77, 55n85,  
98n1  
 Parvis, Sara 65n113, 98n1  
 Pelikan, Jaroslav 6n16  
 Philip, Finny 87n191  
 Pinnock, Clark 1n3  
  
 Porsch, Felix 81n167  
 Powell, Douglas 15n16, 192n118  
 Presley, Stephen O. 18n63, 19n69, 23n78,  
102n14, 105–106, 109n31, 110, 112n47,  
113n49, 114n51, 123n75  
 Price, R.M. 77n155  
 Price, Simon 25n84, 26n85  
 Prigent, Pierre 64n105  
  
 Quasten, Johannes 152n11, 154n19  
  
 Rabens, Volker 4n7  
 Radde-Gallwitz, Andrew 7n19  
 Rankin, David 149n1, 153n17, 162n42,  
166n53, 182n81, 183n85, 187n99, 189,  
191, 192n118  
 Rapp, Claudia 145n148  
 Rasimus, Tuomas 86n190  
 Remus, Harold 70n132, 71n133  
 Reno, R.R. 110n35, 179n73  
 Richardson, Peter 95n217  
 Rives, James B. 24n82  
 Robinson, J. Armitage 98n2, 100  
 Rokéah, David 29n1, 48n70, 67n120, 72n136,  
72n137  
 Rondeau, Marie-Josèphe 15–16, 18–19, 37n35,  
38n42, 105n19, 108n27, 157n29, 161n37,  
161n39, 162n43, 162n45, 167n54  
 Roth, Dieter T. 76n154  
 Rowe, C. Kavin 4n8  
 Rutherford, Will 67n119  
  
 Schniewind, Julius 119n66  
 Schweizer, Eduard 81n169  
 Scott, Alan 68  
 Segal, Alan F. 31n13, 71n134, 72n136, 73n139,  
73n142, 75n149, 78n163, 78n166  
 Sell, Jesse 139n129  
 Shotwell, W.A. 71n133, 72n137  
 Simonetti, Manlio 194n125, 198n143, 199n146,  
200n151, 201n154  
 Sjöberg, Erik 72n139, 82n174  
 Skarsaune, Oskar 27, 36n33, 39n44, 39n45,  
41n55, 42n57, 42n58, 43n62, 44n64,  
48n70, 52n76, 54n79, 55n84, 59n91,  
60n96, 62n98, 62n100, 64–67, 70n130,  
71n135, 72n136, 72n138, 73, 74n143,  
75n147, 75n148, 76n151, 76n152, 86n190,  
91n207, 91n209, 120n69, 159n34, 165n50

- Slusser, Michael 13n48, 15n57, 16–19, 29n1, 36n30, 38n38, 38n40, 38n42, 39n45, 64n104, 65n113, 98n2, 105n19, 155n26, 157n29, 161, 162n45
- Small, Brian C. 35n25
- Stanton, Graham N. 30n4, 30n5, 30n7, 32n18, 55n82
- Steenberg, M.C. Irenaeus 110n38, 111n41, 124n77, 124n78, 124n79
- Stegman, Claire Ann Bradley 152n12, 178n70, 185n89, 186n95
- Stewart-Sykes, Alistair 150n4
- Stowers, Stanley K. 13n46, 35n25
- Strathmann, Hermann 82n172, 119n65
- Stuhlmacher, Peter 88n199
- Stylianopoulos, Theodore 48n70, 74n144, 75n147, 78n165
- Swete, Henry B. 3n6, 6n16, 30n3, 76n154, 100, 142n140, 153–154
- Tabbernee, William 151n4, 201
- Talbert, Charles H. 84n181
- Taylor, Miriam S. 24n82
- Thiselton, Anthony C. 3n6, 3n7, 4n8, 73n139, 73n141, 81n167, 87n191, 91n207, 91n210, 151n5
- Thom, Johan C. 9n31
- Thomassen, Einar 99n3, 111n41, 111n42
- Thompson, Marianne Meyre 81n168, 81n169
- Towner, Philip H. 139n129, 139n130
- Trakatellis, Demetrius C. 39n44, 39n45, 41n55, 44n64, 66
- Trevett, Christine 150n4, 151n6, 192n118
- Tuckett, Christopher M. 24n80, 86n190, 91n208
- Turcescu, Lucian 6n14
- Turner, Max 3n6
- Villani, Andrea 19n69
- Wainwright, Arthur W. 4n8
- Wallace, Daniel B. 3n7
- Waszink, J.H. 149n2
- Wendel, Susan 30n8
- Werline, Rodney 91n207
- Wiles, Maurice 195n128
- Wilhite, David E. 149n1, 153–154, 162n44, 177n68, 178, 192n118
- Wilken, Robert L. 70n130
- Williams, M.A. 99n3
- Witherington III, Ben 88n195, 89n200
- Yeago, David S. 4n8
- Young, Frances M. 23n77, 23n78, 25n84, 26n85, 35n23, 35n24, 110n35
- Zañartu, Sergio 152n11
- Zilling, Heinrike Maria 149n1, 192n118
- Zizioulas, John D. 6n14

# Index of Names and Subjects

- apologists 25–27, 29, 41, 70n129, 101  
apostles 102, 109, 112, 119n66, 120n70, 129–131, 143, 151, 161n39, 178n69, 187  
Apostolic Fathers 24n80, 27, 40, 94n217, 96  
apostolic succession 109, 112, 131  
Aristides 95n217  
Athanasius 5n11, 9n28, 96–97, 202n157, 210, 213  
Augustine 9, 204, 210
- baptism 1, 195, 212  
Basil of Caesarea 5, 9n28, 90n206, 96–97, 147, 210  
binitarianism 22, 30n5, 31, 37, 48, 75n149, 78, 101, 162n44, 206, 211, 212
- Cappadocians 4, 6n14, 21, 27, 213  
Carthage 149, 192–193, 203  
Christ / Son  
    ascension 60, 62n98, 68, 132n102  
    baptism 12, 20, 44–45, 53n78, 85, 169  
    church 55, 57–58, 92, 177, 179  
    creative role 50–51, 53, 54n79, 57, 123, 174, 176  
    death 49–50, 64, 83n180, 85, 135, 174  
    exaltation 31n13, 42, 55  
    fulfillment of prophecy 14, 52, 64–65, 67n120, 73, 109, 172  
    generation 53–54, 168–171, 173n63, 174–176, 199n148  
    Gentile mission 49–51, 57, 107, 112, 122–123, 168–171, 180  
    incarnation 38n38, 49, 83n180, 112n44, 125, 129, 132, 134n108, 171, 173n63, 176n67  
    judgment 57, 58n87, 158, 171  
    nativity 49–50, 56–57, 174, 176  
    passion 49, 52, 56–57, 85, 109, 125, 134n108, 169, 171, 173n64, 176  
    pre-existence 12, 72, 54n79, 106, 176n67, 199  
    reign 42, 55–57, 60, 122, 169, 171, 180  
    resurrection 78n165, 83n180, 125–126, 137  
    vindication 53–54, 132
- Christianity / Christian  
    heresy 22, 25, 69, 75, 145, 152, 193, 201, 209  
    identity / self-definition 22, 24, 69–70, 73, 75–76, 79, 96, 113, 133, 139n129, 208–209  
    orthodoxy 7n17, 22, 24–25, 69, 98, 133n103, 134, 189, 209  
Christology 16, 26n86, 31n13, 32, 54n79, 83n178, 101, 199n148, 207  
Clement of Alexandria 212  
cosmogony 111n41, 124, 141–142  
Creator 33, 39n43, 110, 123–124, 127–128, 132, 146, 164n48, 168–170, 180, 185  
Cyprian 27–28, 151, 157, 194–199, 201, 203
- demiurge 75, 78, 136, 142–143  
Dionysius of Rome 202n157
- economy, divine 28, 99, 133–147, 150, 152, 182–193, 195, 200, 202–205, 209–210  
Ephesus 134n107  
eucharist 197–198  
Eunomius of Cyzicus 5n10  
Eusebius 138n125, 149n1  
Eustathius of Sebaste 5n10
- Father *see* Creator
- Gnosticism / Gnostics 28, 71, 78–79, 99, 102, 105–106, 109–111, 113, 120, 123–124, 128, 133–136, 139n127, 141–146, 148, 149n2, 209, 211  
    *See also* Valentinianism  
Gospels / gospel 18, 44, 81–84, 86, 109, 118–119, 129, 131, 151, 170, 172n62, 183, 187  
Gregory of Nazianzus 6, 9n28, 96n218, 147, 210  
Gregory of Nyssa 5n13, 6
- Hilary of Poitiers 204n160  
Hippolytus 13, 43n60, 150n3, 184n86, 185n91  
Holy Spirit  
    creative role 8–9, 101, 123–124, 127, 170, 172, 176  
    deity 5, 90n206, 96, 101, 147, 211

- discipline 151, 153, 187, 189n105, 192–194, 203  
experience 7n16, 84, 94, 208, 212  
gender 3n7  
gifts 73, 87  
hand of God 123, 185n88  
inspirer of Scripture 13, 30, 32, 45, 47, 55, 59, 72, 101, 108, 126n84, 143–144, 177–178, 197  
personhood 3, 12, 15–22, 32–33, 38, 45, 54–55, 58–63, 101, 113, 117, 153–155, 161–162, 166, 176, 178, 185–186, 189–191, 194, 196–198, 200–201, 203–205, 207–212  
possession 73, 85n186, 88–89, 137, 144  
revealer of the economy 137–147, 186–191, 203, 209  
setter of doctrine 153, 187–189, 193–194  
*See also* Paraclete; pneumatology  
*hypostasis* 2n4, 4, 6, 161, 212  
hypothesis 109, 134–135
- Iconium, Synod of 201
- Irenaeus  
Gnosticism, engagement with 99, 105, 109–114, 123–124, 128, 133–136, 141–146, 209  
hermeneutic 109–110, 134–135  
Justin Martyr, comparison with 103–105, 108–109, 113–117, 120, 130, 133, 140, 145–146  
Justin Martyr, dependence on 98n2, 120  
legacy and significance 147–148, 210–212  
pneumatology 8, 99–102, 137–146, 209  
prosopological exegesis 13, 105–110, 113–117, 121–128, 206–208  
Theophilus, influence of 101n9, 102, 123
- Jerome 149n1, 195n127, 199n146
- John / Johannine 80–87, 94, 96, 118–119, 136, 139, 153, 187, 200
- John of Damascus 139
- Judaism / Jewish / Jews  
anti-Jewish polemic 37, 48 59, 69–70  
competition with Christians 65, 69–73, 78–79, 208  
rabbis 70–72, 75  
scribes 64n106  
theology 11, 31–32, 36, 55, 72–73, 100–101, 106, 147, 204
- Justin Martyr  
hermeneutic 15, 75–76  
Judaism, engagement with 69–74, 96, 208  
legacy and significance 96–97, 208, 210–212  
Marcionism, engagement with 69, 74–76, 96  
Middle Platonism, engagement with 69, 77–79, 96  
New Testament, use of 86–87, 90–91, 93–94, 96  
pneumatology 29–32, 55, 58, 73, 77–78, 208  
prosopological exegesis 13, 18–19, 26, 36–63, 96, 206–208  
*testimonia*, use of 42–43, 64–67, 96
- Lactantius 202n157
- Logos 30–31, 36–38, 47, 53n78, 67, 70, 73n140, 108, 150n3, 161  
*See also* Christ / Son; Christology
- Marcion / Marcionism 28, 43, 67, 69, 72–76, 78–79, 92, 96, 138n125, 142
- Melito of Sardis 67
- Methodius of Olympus 213n2
- Middle Platonism 69, 77–79, 89–90, 96, 111, 133n102  
*See also* philosophy
- modalism / modalistic monarchianism 8, 150, 152, 154–156, 158, 162, 182–185, 190, 192n119, 193, 199–200, 211–212
- monarchy, divine 152, 184–185, 188–189, 200
- Montanism *see* New Prophecy
- Nag Hammadi 99n3, 105n20, 111, 124n77, 139n127
- New Prophecy 15, 28, 138n125, 150–153, 154n22, 157, 162n44, 177–178, 181–182, 187–190, 192–194, 201–204, 209
- Nicaea, Council of 25, 101, 147, 194, 203, 210
- Nicene Creed 1, 202
- Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed 5
- Noetus 150n3
- Novatian 27, 28, 151, 157, 194, 199–201, 203

- Origen 9, 16, 26n87, 96n218, 179n73,  
189n104, 191n113, 194n125, 202n158, 212–  
213
- Paraclete 4n7, 81–83, 139n127, 141n137, 151,  
153, 172, 183–184, 186–188, 190, 191n112,  
193–194, 200–201, 203  
*See also* Holy Spirit; pneumatology
- Paul / Pauline 3n7, 4n8, 17, 28, 78, 80,  
87–91, 94, 112n47, 119n67, 129, 141n137,  
153, 154n22, 162n44, 170, 180, 191n113
- persona* 2n4, 13, 35, 156, 161, 163, 178n69,  
180n77, 181, 186, 189n106, 197n137,  
200n151, 204, 207, 210–211
- Philo 106n24, 184n86
- philosophy 28, 37, 38n38, 69, 77–78, 90,  
191  
*See also* Middle Platonism
- Pleroma 111, 141–143
- pneumatology  
angelomorphic 32, 101  
Ayres-Barnes schema 7–9, 97, 100, 106,  
147–148, 151–152, 174n64, 194n125, 204,  
210–211  
Jewish / Jewish-Christian 3, 7–8, 31–32,  
72–73, 100–101, 106, 176, 204, 211  
post-Nicene 4–9, 96–97, 112n45, 147, 152,  
204, 210–211  
traditional narrative 2–6, 97, 204, 209–  
210  
*See also* Holy Spirit; Irenaeus, pneuma-  
tology; Justin Martyr, pneumatology;  
Tertullian, pneumatology
- prophets 19, 20n73, 30, 38, 47, 55, 58, 63n103,  
78, 91n211, 101, 107–108, 122n71, 125, 130–  
131, 138n125, 142–144
- prosopological exegesis  
ancient descriptions 37–38, 106–107,  
158–159  
definition 36, 42  
ontological status of persons 19n70  
previous scholarship 12–21, 36–38, 105–  
106, 155, 157, 160–162, 195–197, 212  
primary vs. secondary agent 20, 38, 45,  
55, 58–59, 61, 80, 93, 117, 196  
relation to prosopopoeia 35  
*See also* Irenaeus, prosopological exegesis;  
Justin Martyr, prosopological exegesis;  
Tertullian, prosopological exegesis
- prosōpon* 13, 17, 19, 35–37, 38n40, 39, 46–47,  
51–52, 60, 107, 112–113, 156, 161, 163, 204,  
207
- prosopopoeia 12n46, 35–36
- Quadratus 25n84
- Quintilian 35
- recapitulation 124, 135, 137
- regula fidei* 100, 109–110, 116, 135, 139, 144,  
182–183, 186–187, 190, 191n112, 193, 199
- rhetoric / rhetoricians 2, 9–11, 22, 35, 44, 85,  
106, 134, 162n44, 206
- Rome 74, 86, 98n2, 138n125, 150n3, 193, 199
- Tertullian  
Cyprian, influence on 195–196, 198  
hermeneutic 15, 158, 160–161, 182–183  
Irenaeus, comparison with 156–161, 163–  
166, 171n59, 172, 173n64, 175–176, 182,  
204–205  
Irenaeus, dependence on 149n2, 160  
Justin Martyr, comparison with 156–161,  
163–166, 171n59, 173n64  
Justin Martyr, dependence on 149n2, 160  
legacy and significance 203–204, 210–  
212  
modalism, engagement with 150, 152,  
155–156, 158, 162, 182–185, 190, 193  
New Prophecy, influence of 150–153,  
162n44, 178, 182, 187–190, 192–194, 201–  
202, 209  
Novatian, influence on 199–201  
pneumatology 8–9, 151–155, 176–178, 184–  
191, 193–194, 202–203  
prosopological exegesis 13–19, 155–181,  
202, 206–208, 210  
*testimonia* 27, 42–43, 63–66, 68, 96, 104n16  
theodrama, divine 18–20, 33, 45, 55, 58, 95–  
96, 108, 113, 117, 128, 140, 146, 196, 198,  
204, 207–208, 211–212  
theophanies 39, 66–67, 69n127, 73, 75–76,  
96, 173n64  
Theophilus 8n21, 101n9, 102, 123, 171n59  
*topos* of divine testimony 2, 9–12, 20, 26,  
44–45, 51, 73, 85, 95, 119, 128n86, 132, 172
- Trinity / Trinitarianism  
by continuity in prosopological exegesis  
21, 162, 212

- concept of person 13–14, 21, 160–161, 186, 204
- controversy 4–6, 41
- development 2n5, 11n40, 18, 21–22, 31, 45, 152–154, 158, 185, 194, 199, 204, 206, 209, 212
- metaphors / analogies 19n70, 21, 183–186, 188, 191, 212
- subordinationism 8n23, 30, 152, 185, 189
- two powers 31, 61, 66, 71–72, 73n142, 75, 78–79, 103, 114, 165
- Valentinianism 28, 78n164, 99n3, 111, 138n125, 141–143, 146  
*See also* Gnosticism / Gnostics
- Wisdom 8, 54n79, 111n41, 127, 141, 174–176
- Word 27, 31–33, 53, 125–126, 132n102, 140, 143, 158, 171n59, 183–184, 186, 188  
*See also* Christ / Son; Logos
- Zephyrinus 150n3